DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 328 CE 067 523

AUTHOR Gansneder, Bruce M.; And Others
TITLE An Assessment of Research Needs in Community Education.
INSTITUTION Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE Jun 80
CONTRACT 78-489
NOTE 104p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adult Educators; Agency Cooperation; *Citizen Participation; *Community Education; *Educational Research; Needs Assessment; *Research Needs; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study of research needs was conducted for the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, focusing on facility use, interagency relationships, and citizen participation. Following a study of earlier research in the region, a survey instrument was constructed and sent to 1,396 identified community educators, with a total of 911 returned. The study found that community educators in the field exhibit a strong interest in research and that they want to participate in research. Suggested area of research included the following: (1) status research on citizen attitudes; (2) relational research on citizen attitudes; (3) theoretical research on citizen attitudes; (4) theoretical research on barriers and facilitators to interagency relationships; (5) status research on interagency relationships; and (6) relational research on interagency relationships. (The report contains 50 references, 24 tables, and 11 figures.) Prior research and the survey instrument are included in an appendix.) (KC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

CE

ED 375 328

# AN ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH NEEDS

# IN

# COMMUNITY EDUCATION

by

BRUCE M. GANSNEDER
BARBARA ROCHEN
DABNEY LEWIS

with

MICHAEL H. KAPLAN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Gansneder

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CE 067 523

# AN ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH NEEDS
# IN
# COMMUNITY EDUCATION

prepared for the
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education
University of Virginia

by
Bruce M. Gansneder, Ph.D., Bureau of Educational Research
Barbara Rochen, Bureau of Educational Research
Dabney Lewis, Bureau of Educational Research
with
Michael H. Kaplan, Ph.D., Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education

*This Research was supported by C.S. Mott Foundation, Grant No. 78-489 to the Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium (M. H. Kaplan, Principal Investigator, Research and Evaluation Component) and by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Virginia. The interpretations and conclusions contained in this publication represent the views of the grantee (or authors) and not necessarily those of the Mott Foundation, its trustees, or officers.*

June, 1980

## PREFACE

The Mid–Atlantic Center for Community Education at the University of Virginia is actively engaged in community education research and evaluation. Not enough research studies are available which contain data helpful to community education professionals and policy makers. Rather than conducting research in a fragmented fashion, we sought, in this study, to assess perceived research needs. From the results, we hope to develop an agenda for further research. The authors welcome comments from the field, especially from those who would like to work with us on future studies. We are particularly interested in collaborating with field practitioners who have building level or school district responsibility for community education development.

Our research team would like to acknowledge several individuals who responded to us individually or to the entire team. Professor Michael Caldwell was particularly helpful, as a member of the Mid–Atlantic Research and Evaluation Board, in helping to conceptualize the present study. Professor Larry Decker helped us with categorizing the survey instrument. Marlene Strom, a graduate assistant, worked with us in the early phases of the project, reviewing literature, but moved on to New York. Toby Segal of the National Community Education Association (NCEA) took time from her busy schedule to run several sets of labels and printouts for us. Both Guy Faust and Paul Tremper advised us on sampling from the NCEA membership. Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to all dedicated community educators who responded to our survey. The 66% response rate gave us a real boost.

It is impossible to recall everyone who gave us feedback or commented on the study. There was a high level of interest from the field. Requests for the results were included with a number of the surveys; here they are! Let us hear from you.

Michael H. Kaplan
Charlottesville, Virginia
June, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| PREFACE | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | ix |
| CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2. BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT | 5 |
| Review of the Cook Reports | 5 |
| Development of the Conceptual Framework of the Study | 9 |
| CHAPTER 3. METHODS | 15 |
| Instrumentation | 15 |
| Sampling and Data Collection Procedures | 20 |
| Data Processing Procedures | 21 |
| CHAPTER 4. RESULTS | 23 |
| Description of the Sample | 24 |
| Rating of Research Needs: Total Sample | 31 |
| Greatest and Second Greatest Need: Total Sample | 34 |
| Rating of Research Needs by Selected Groups | 34 |
| Rating of Research Needs by Responsibility Level | 34 |
| Rating of Research Needs by Region | 43 |
| Rating of Research Needs by Degree Level of Respondents | 43 |
| Rating of Research Needs by Type of Formal Training | 47 |
| CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY | 51 |
| CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 63 |
| Specific Recommendations | 64 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 69 |
| APPENDICES | 73 |
| A1. Research Questions and Needs as Listed in Cook's Facility Use Patterns Research Report | 73 |
| A2. Research Questions and Needs as Listed in Cook's Interagency Relationships Research Report | 75 |
| A3. Research Questions and Needs as Listed in Cook's Citizen Participation Issues Research Report | 79 |
| B. Sample Survey of Research Needs in Community Education | 83 |
| C. Summary of the Number of Surveys Sent and Returned and the Rate of Return by Region and State | 89 |

## LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Number of Surveys Sent, Number of Surveys Returned, and Return Rate by Region | 25 |
| 2. | A Summary of Return Rates by Region Relative to Number and Percentage of Surveys Sent | 25 |
| 3. | A Summary of the Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Age Group | 25 |
| 4. | Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Length of Time as a Professional in the Field of Community Education | 27 |
| 5. | Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Length of Time in Present Position | 27 |
| 6. | Frequency and Percentage of Respondents Indicating Specific Levels of Responsibility | 29 |
| 7. | Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Primary Level of Responsibility | 30 |
| 8. | Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Highest Degree Held | 30 |
| 9. | Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Type of Formal Training in Community Education | 30 |
| 10. | Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for Each Content Area by Type of Research for the Total Sample | 32 |
| 11. | Means, Standard Deviations, and Rankings of the Fifteen Areas Having the Highest Rated Need for Research | 35 |
| 12. | Areas Mentioned Most Often as Having the Greatest Research Need for Status, Theoretical, and Relational Research | 36 |
| 13. | Areas Mentioned Most Often as Having the Second Greatest Research Need for Status, Theoretical, and Relational Research | 36 |
| 14. | A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Status Research Needs Among Persons with Differing Responsibility Levels | 37 |
| 15. | A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Theoretical Research Needs Among Persons with Differing Responsibility Levels | 40 |
| 16. | A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Relational Research Needs Among Persons with Differing Responsibility Levels | 42 |
| 17. | A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Status Research Needs Among Persons in Different Geographical Regions of the United States | 44 |

| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 18. | A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Theoretical Research Needs Among Persons in Different Geographical Regions of the United States | 45 |
| 19. | A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Relational Research Needs Among Persons in Different Geographical Regions of the United States | 46 |
| 20. | A Summary of Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Research Needs Among Persons Holding Different Academic Degrees | 48 |
| 21. | A Summary of Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Research Needs Among Persons with Different Kinds of Formal Training | 49 |
| 22. | A Summary of the Most Needed (Top 4) and Least Needed (Bottom 4) Areas of Research by Type of Research as Rated by the Total Sample | 57 |
| 23. | Top and Bottom Four Rated Research Need Areas for Each Type of Research by Responsibility Level | 58 |
| 24. | Top and Bottom Four Rated Research Need Areas for Each Type of Research by Geographic Region. | 60 |

## LIST OF FIGURES


| Figure | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Postulated framework for classification of research questions. | 10 |
| 2. | Subareas generated for each research area. | 11 |
| 3. | Two-dimensional category system for facility use research area. | 12 |
| 4. | Two-dimensional category system for interagency relationships research area. | 12 |
| 5. | Two-dimensional category system for citizen participation research area. | 13 |
| 6. | Items for Part A | 16 |
| 7. | Items for Part B | 17 |
| 8. | Items for Part C | 18 |
| 9. | Demographic Items | 19 |
| 10. | Subareas generated for each research area. | 55 |
| 11. | Framework for development of the survey instrument. | 55 |

## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction and Purpose

Much has been written about the need for increased research and evaluation efforts in community education. Yet it appears that these efforts continue to be minimal. As Van Voorhees stated in 1972:

> There is currently little research that either supports or denies the effectiveness of community education. Proponents have begun to gather information about its purposes and effects but, by and large, what we have so far are reports of increased attendance, touching stories about individual success, and opinion—lots of opinion. Several decades after its birth as an educational movement, community education is still supported not by facts but by the logic of the process. (Van Voorhees, 1972, p. 203)

The research and evaluation that has been conducted has tended to be descriptive and exploratory. Much of the research has actually been conducted by graduate students as a portion of their requirements for the doctoral degree. A host of reasons can be advanced to explain this. It could be the result of the lack of funds available, limited knowledge about the conduct of research and evaluation, or insufficient time in the daily life of the professional community educator. It may be that research and evaluation are not valued highly by the practicing community educator. It also could be that research problems have not been identified and crystalized because of the complex purposes, context, and activities of community education. A number of efforts have been made to improve the research and evaluation knowledge of community educators (e.g., Burbach and Decker, 1979; Gansneder, 1979; *Community Education Journal*, 1975; and Wood and Santellanes, 1977). Yet, little work has been done to identify key research areas in community education. Two notable exceptions were the national research symposia sponsored by the National Community Education Association (NCEA) in 1971 and 1974. The majority of the available community education materials are oriented toward defining the philosophy of community education and discussing implementation of the process of community education.

Recognizing this problem, the Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium has entered into a series of efforts aimed at identifying research needs and, ultimately, at developing systematic funded research efforts. A five year plan (1978-1983) was developed to accomplish this task (Kaplan and Sponsler, 1978). This plan included the awarding of mini-grants ($500-$1500) for specific research projects. Toward this aim, the Mid-Atlantic

Consortium established the Research and Evaluation Board to assist in the development of criteria for identifying the types of research to be undertaken. At the July, 1978, meeting of the Board, eight community education goals were identified:

(1) increased use of community facilities
(2) lifelong learning and enrichment opportunities
(3) interagency coordination and cooperation
(4) increased citizen involvement and participation
(5) increased use of human and community resources
(6) enriched sense of community
(7) improved school-community relationships
(8) financial saving through reduction of unnecessary duplication and fragmentation

It was determined that it was not necessary to pursue research on all eight goals at the same time or with the same intensity. Since three of the goals—enriched sense of community, improved school-community relations, and lifelong learning—were somewhat difficult to define and might require different sorts of investigation, they were to be handled differently from the remaining five goals which could easily be operationalized. Three common themes encompassed these five goals: facility use, interagency cooperation, and citizen participation. In order to promote a more organized research effort, it was necessary to assess the existing state of research in these three areas. Since no comprehensive review of the research in these areas was available, a contract was entered into with Nancy Cook to produce reviews of the areas.

The three Cook reports (Cook, 1979a; Cook, 1979b; Cook, 1979c) provided comprehensive reviews of the areas of Citizen Participation, Facility Use, and Interagency Relationships. In addition, the reports indicated 150 potential research questions and needs. The Board attempted to review the reports and their research questions in hopes of choosing a few target areas for research; however, this task proved exceptionally difficult. The following questions remained unanswered: which areas were to be chosen? what criteria could be used to choose them? how could the 150 research questions and needs be organized conceptually into a smaller set of target research areas? how could all of this be done in a nonarbitrary way?

At this point (Summer, 1979) the Board directed Michael Kaplan, the Associate Director of the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, to fund a research study which would identify community education research needs. The premise of this decision was that practicing community educators' perceptions of research needs would provide essential (but not the only) input for making final decisions about target research areas. An agreement was made with Bruce Gansneder and the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Virginia to conduct this project from October 1, 1979, to June 30, 1980.

The following parameters were established for the project:

(1) The focus would continue to be on Citizen Participation, Facility Use, and Interagency Relationships

(2) The research questions identified in the three Cook reports would provide the starting point for the development of an appropriate conceptual framework for the study

(3) Practicing community educators would compose the target respondent population

(4) Perceptions of research needs would be determined and prioritized

(5) Discrepancies in the perceptions of community educators differing according to selected characteristics would be determined.

The last two parameters suggest the two general research questions of this study: (1) what are the research needs in community education as perceived by community educators? and (2) are research needs perceived differently by community educators who differ according to selected characteristics? These two general questions were later translated into a number of more specific questions, including the following:

(1) How do community educators assess the need for selected types of research?

(2) Do community educators from different regions of the country assess research needs differently?

(3) Do community educators with differing responsibilities (i.e., university, state, school system, school building, other) assess research needs differently?

The project involved six major phases. The first phase involved a review and analysis of the Cook reports. The primary purpose of this phase was to develop the conceptual framework for the research. After the review of the reports was completed, a content-analytic sorting was made of all the research questions identified in the reports. This sorting provided the basis for developing 54 categories of research. The second phase of the study involved the development of a survey instrument to measure the degree to which practicing community educators perceived that there was a need for research in each of these 54 categories. The third phase involved selection of the sample of target respondents. The fourth phase consisted of the actual data collection, while the fifth phase involved data processing and analysis. The final phase was the preparation of this report.

The remainder of this report is organized around the six phases of the project. A review of the Cook reports and a summary of the development of the conceptual framework of the study are presented in chapter 2. Instrumentation, sampling and data collection procedures, and data processing procedures are presented in chapter 3. The results are presented in chapter 4. A summary is presented in chapter 5. Conclusions and recommendations are presented in chapter 6.

## CHAPTER 2

### Background and Development

*Review of the Cook Reports*

The three reports completed for the Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium by Nancy Cook provided the primary background for this study. These reports were used as the foundation for this study for two major reasons. First, they represent the best available reviews of research in the three areas of interest. Second, use of these reports will aid in the attainment of a coordinated, systematic five year research program. Too often the choice of research areas is the result of whim or chance, producing research which is neither systematic nor coordinated. As a result, single pieces of research do not build upon one another and no long term gains are made. The research begun by Nancy Cook continues with this study and, ideally, will be followed by other studies. This should produce both a sharper definition of research needs and the inception of research studies in the identified areas of need.

Each of the three Cook reports provides a review of the literature and a listing of research needs and questions for that area. In producing the literature reviews Cook utilized computerized literature searches, various educational indices, *Dissertation Abstracts,* and catalogues. Fugitive materials were procured through personal correspondence. The research needs cited in each area were derived from several sources: questions identified during 1971 and 1974 research symposia in community education at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana; questions suggested by the Research Committee of the National Community Education Association and by the former Office of Community Education Research at the University of Michigan; Nancy Cook's own intuitive ideas; and contributions by members of a review team which reacted to various drafts of the papers. A list of the research questions and needs from each of Cook's reports is included in Appendix A.

These reports provide an interesting view of the state of research or, at least, an indication of the quantity of research in community education. The report on facility use patterns includes 155 citations, with only 12 (7.74%) being research studies. The report on citizen participation contains 252 citations; 53 (21.0%) of these are research studies. The interagency relationships report includes 216 citations but only 22 (10.2%) of these are research studies. As an attempt was made to uncover all available *research,* percentages reported above may actually overrepresent the amount of research completed. This evidence suggests that

the belief in the necessity of more research in community education is an accurate one.

For this study, the primary importance of the three Cook reports lies in the research questions posed; therefore, only a brief summary of the reports is provided here.

The first of the papers, that concerned with facility use patterns (Cook, 1979b), describes literature and research concerning public school facility use relative to community education. Both the historical and current aspects are covered. Findings are divided into two major categories—literature and research. The literature portion includes two sections. The first, an introductory section, contains a discussion of the historical basis for use of public school buildings, a glossary of relevant terms, a justification and rationale based on both history and evolving trends, and a discussion of past and present legislation and legal parameters. The second section contains a discussion of four emergent patterns or forms of faculty use: extended use, joint use, re-use, and multiple use. The research portion of the facility use paper contains a review of research and describes the purposes and findings of various studies concerning facility use as it relates to community education. As mentioned above, only 12 research studies were found concerning this topic. The earliest study reviewed was a 1927 study by Eleanor Glueck concerning the extent to which public school buildings were being used for community purposes. A 1969 study by Boerrigter identified procedures and techniques for facility use which would not hinder the regular kindergarten through twelfth grade program. In 1962 a national survey was undertaken by *School Management Magazine* (Community use of your schools, March, 1962) to determine the extent to which public school facilities were being used. A study was undertaken by McQuarrie in 1963 to determine the use of public primary schools in Washington state. A 1965 study by Turner was concerned with outdoor industrial and recreational use of large rural and suburban secondary school facilities in North Carolina. This study attempted both to determine the reasons for not using the schools more extensively for those purposes and to develop suggestions for increasing the use. In 1966 Holland undertook a study in Missouri to analyze school board policies and administrative practices influencing the community use of public school facilities. A similar study in Utah was made by Hafen in 1968. A subsequent study of the availability and extent of school facility usage in Utah was undertaken by Thorstenson in 1969. Then, in 1972, Thorstenson's study was replicated by Otto in Wisconsin. Similar studies were also made by Koller in 1973 for the state of Alabama and by Beasley in 1977 for the state of Arkansas. Current research on this topic is also underway by Educational Facilities Laboratories through a program funded by the C. S. Mott Foundation.

The report concerning interagency relationships (Cook, 1979c) describes the literature and research concerning both the historical basis for interagency relationships and the current status of how these relationships operate in relation to community education

practice. Findings are again reported in two major portions of the paper—a literature portion and a research portion. The literature portion contains four sections: (1) an introductory section discussing the purpose of the study, a glossary of relevant terms, and a discussion of the historical basis for interagency relationships; (2) a section describing the types of agencies involved in interagency relationships, their types of involvement, and their reasons for alliances; (3) a section concerning the rationale for interagency relationships, including the benefits of and barriers to the development of these partnerships; (4) a section concerning facilitation of interagency relationships, including management models and descriptive accounts.

The research portion of the interagency relationship paper contains a review of research which describes the purposes and findings of various studies concerning interagency patterns as they relate to community education. It was found that very few investigators had studied the extent of interagency relationships in general. In 1972 Tasse conducted a study to identify the key components of school-agency cooperation and their relationships to community education. In 1974 Sumrall researched the extent to which agencies formed partnernships for better service delivery by interfacing the community school, the educational park, and neighborhood service centers. In 1977 Cook researched the state of community education development in South Carolina. In addition, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (1976) and Voland (1978) conducted research on general interagency partnerships.

Only one study, that by Beder in 1972, dealt with school-adult education alliances. This study described and analyzed the linkage relationships which were found to exist in urban, public school, adult basic education programs in six cities.

Several studies were found which related to school-recreation agency partnerships for providing comprehensive recreation programs. In 1960, the National Recreation Association surveyed 22 cities which had 12 month programs in order to determine the amount of cooperation between the recreation agencies and school districts for joint facility use. Hafen's 1968 study had as a purpose the development of guidelines to assist Utah school systems in writing policies to foster more extensive and cooperative use of public school facilities. Thorstenson (1969), in another Utah study, looked at the availability and extent of school facility use for community recreation. Similar studies were conducted in various other states by several different researchers (see Cook, 1979c).

Recently, several studies have focused on the coordination between community colleges and community schools. Hansen, in 1974, studied channels of cooperation between state agencies responsible for postsecondary education through a survey of adult and continuing education agencies, vocational and technical education agencies, community and junior colleges. Weiss (also in 1974) undertook a five-state (Oregon, Washington, California, Michigan, Florida) study to determine the amount of cooperation and coordination existing in communities where there were both community colleges and community school

programs. In 1974 the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) sponsored a study to assess community college-community school cooperation nationwide (DuBois and Drake, 1975). A similar study was undertaken by Valdes in 1975. In 1976 the AACFC conducted a second national study concerning offerings in community education; administration in community education; characteristics of relationships in community education; and the types of cooperation, funding, and policy in community education.

A few recent studies have also explored the extent of coordination between local school systems and health agencies. In 1974 Cannon undertook a study to determine the interrelationships between 11 public school districts and a county mental health agency. Also in 1974, Gay made an attempt to develop a school health model which stressed interagency involvement. In addition to the studies described above, there have been several detailed inquiries into the interagency partnerships of a specific community, school district, or school (see Cook, 1979c).

The third paper, which covered citizen participation issues (Cook, 1979a), describes the literature and research concerning both the historical basis and the current status of citizen participation as it relates to community education. Findings are, again, reported in two major sections—literature and research. The literature portion contains three sections: (1) an introductory section discussing the purpose of the report, the rationale for citizen participation, and the function of citizen participation in community education; (2) a section on models of involvement which includes historical perspectives and forms of citizen participation; (3) a section on the value of citizen participation which focuses on the barriers to and benefits of citizen participation.

The research portion of the paper contains a review of research which describes the purposes and findings of various studies concerning citizen participation issues in community education. A large number of studies were found to pertain to the various aspects and dimensions of citizen participation or involvement. Most of these have been doctoral dissertations, and the majority relate to community councils. In 1958 Naslund and Brown reviewed existing research to identify studies in the following six areas: (1) decision-making and power structure in the community, (2) avenues of control of public education by localities, (3) school-community interaction, (4) attitudes toward schools, (5) factors associated with attitudes toward schools, (6) publicity practices and public relations. In 1974 and 1975 the Institute for Responsive Education conducted a study to determine the nationwide status of citizen participation in educational decision-making (Stanwick, 1975). Various patterns or modes of participation were discussed in various other studies. In 1977 Liechty investigated patterns of citizen participation in education. In 1975 Stromquist studied conditions of participation, particularly in educational planning. Also in 1975, Miller conducted a

study concerning the function of schools as determiners and reflectors of society in a community. In 1969 the Urban Coalition conducted a study in 13 cities to determine which citizens participated in school affairs, who they represented, what forum was used, what issues were considered, what tactics were used by participants, what sanctions were available to them, the success of the program, and the strengths and weaknesses of the program as perceived by various interested audiences (Cunningham and Nystrand, 1969).

Several studies have been concerned with the effects of active participation on alienation, voter response, or school performance. Various studies have also looked at the involvement of citizens in educational decision-making. Quite a few studies were concerned with various aspects of community councils—the role of community councils in citizen participation, the function of community councils, purposes of community councils, evaluation of council effectiveness, perceptions of community council functioning, relationships between school principals and councils, leadership behavior of the community education director in council setting, criteria of successful councils. Various case studies concerning citizen participation were found as were a variety of attitudinal studies (see Cook, 1979a).

*Development of the Conceptual Framework of the Study*

As mentioned above, Cook provided a list of research questions at the end of each report. A total of 155 questions were identified: 28 in the area of facility use patterns, 57 in the area of interagency relationships, 70 in the area of citizen participation (see Appendix A). The Research Board had initially hoped that it would be able to take the questions generated, appoint several working teams, review the questions, select several of the "most important" questions, and then fund researchers—through mini-grants—to conduct the research. A casual glance at the 155 questions provided in Appendix A is all that is needed to recognize that the Board was faced with an enormous task. (It should be pointed out that Cook's task was *not* to provide a comprehensive, conceptually based list of questions, nor was it to prioritize the questions. Her task was to review the literature and identify potential research questions from the available literature, her own insight, and that of the team.)

How does one go about the task of selecting the most important questions? A rank-ordering of the 155 questions is not feasible due both to the sheer number of questions and to the inherent problems in the list. Some small number (say 10) might be selected, but this is impossible without specific criteria to guide the selection. Certainly criteria could be developed which might include value judgments about the importance of the research results to community education, decisions about the immediacy of payoff from the research results, assessment of the feasibility of the research (can it actually be done?), estimates of the cost of the research, and estimates of the length of time it would take to

complete the research. Additional criteria could be developed from any beginning research text (e.g., Selltiz, et. al.). It was apparent to the Research Board, however, that there was an overriding problem in the list of questions: there was no unifying structure that could be used to classify and group the questions. The existence of a unifying structure or conceptual framework would certainly make the task both more manageable and more meaningful.

As a first attempt at organizing the questions, three subareas—finance, role definition and image, and policy and position—were postulated to cut across all three major areas. This resulted in the framework for classification of questions which is shown in Figure 1.

| | Research Areas | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Subareas | Facility Use | Interagency Relationships | Citizen Participation |
| Finance | | | |
| Role Definition and Image | | | |
| Policy and Position | | | |

Figure 1. Postulated framework for classification of research questions

However, when an attempt was made to classify the questions according to this scheme, it was found that not all questions fit reasonably into one of the nine postulated subareas. Recognizing the need for the development of a conceptual framework and for input from professional community educators in the field, the Board suggested that a contract should be made with some outside agency to complete the task.

It was at this point that the authors of this report entered the picture. Discussions were held between Michael Caldwell and Bruce Gansneder of the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Virginia and Michael Kaplan, and a decision was made to attempt the following:

1. develop a conceptual framework for the research questions
2. develop a survey instrument which could be sent to professional community educators in the field
3. conduct this survey and report its results.

After a review of the Cook reports and the research questions that had been identified, a preliminary attempt at a content-analytic sorting of the questions was made. Several problems emerged, some of which resulted from the fact that the questions had no unifying structure or underlying conceptual framework. First, even the application of a simple framework resulted in awareness of both overlapping of questions and gaps in coverage. Second, the level of specificity was found to vary across questions; some questions were very specific,

while others were very general. Third, the degree to which the questions were in operational form, or could be easily translated into operational form, varied. Fourth, while some of the "questions" were actually questions, others were statements. Fifth, the content coverage varied dramatically across the three areas. Sixth, the sampling of questions within any content area varied across content areas.

As a result, a new approach was tried in which an attempt was made first to consolidate questions both by rewriting some questions more broadly so that they encompassed several extremely detailed questions, and by deleting others which were repetitious. In addition, several questions were added to eliminate gaps in coverage of all three major areas. The resulting set of questions was examined and approved at a meeting involving project personnel from the Bureau of Educational Research and the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education. At this meeting, it was also determined that these questions would best be used to generate a smaller number of research subareas independently within each of the three major areas, rather than across all three areas. This was necessary in order, eventually, to produce a survey with a more reasonable number of items at a level of specificity which would be most useful for producing requests for proposals (RFP's). It was felt that survey items as specific as many questions would generate RFP's so specific as to limit researchers.

The subareas generated for each of the major areas are shown in Figure 2.

| Research Area: | Facility Use | Interagency Relationships | Citizen Participation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Subareas: | Policy<br>Cost<br>Nature<br>Use<br>Users<br>Management | Barriers/facilitators<br>Evaluation of interagency relationships<br>Nature<br>Administrative issues<br>Cost<br>Type of agencies involved | Nature of community councils<br>Nature of citizens in the community<br>Citizen attitudes<br>Funding<br>Administrative issues<br>Training of personnel |

Figure 2. Subareas generated for each research area.

All of the research questions fit reasonably well into these categories. Certain questions were found to be repetitious and were deleted. Certain categories were found to include fewer questions, and in some cases questions were added. A second underlying dimension now became apparent. This dimension might be called "type of research." Questions fell into three types along this dimension. Some questions were essentially status assessment kinds of questions, such as the following: "What agencies are involved in the community education process?" "What financial support patterns exist?" "What is the nature and extent of community council support structures?" Although these questions suggest the need for empirical research, there

is no intent to test hypotheses. Other questions appeared to call for nonempirical research aimed at clarifying an issue, a concept, or a variable. This research might involve literature reviews or the development of a theoretical or conceptual model or framework relative to some specific problem. The following are examples of this type of question: "What kind of evaluation is most appropriate for assessing community education programs?" "What does research have to say about the limits of citizen involvement?" A third type of question was oriented toward studying relationships between variables in community education. The following are examples of this type of question: "How do legal factors influence community education costs?" "Is there a relationship between organizational development in schools and community or citizen involvement?"

What finally emerged, therefore, was a two-dimensional category system within each of the three topic areas (i.e., facility use, interagency relationships, and citizen participation). These two-dimensional category systems, which might be called "content focus by type of research," are shown below in Figures 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Thus, within this overall framework each of the three areas—Facility Use, Citizen Participation, and Interagency Relationships—contains 18 research "domains," for a total of 54. This, then, was the conceptual framework which served as the basis for instrument development.

| Facility Use | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Content Focus** | **Type of Research** | | |
| | **Theoretical Analysis** | **Current Status** | **Relationships** |
| Policy<br>Cost<br>Use<br>Management<br>Nature of Facilities<br>Users | | | |

Figure 3. Two-dimensional category system for facility use research area.

| Interagency Relationships | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Content Focus** | **Type of Research** | | |
| | **Theoretical Analysis** | **Current Status** | **Relationships** |
| Barriers/Facilitators<br>Evaluation<br>Nature of Relationships<br>Administrative Issues<br>Costs<br>Types of Agencies | | | |

Figure 4. Two-dimensional category system for interagency relationships research area.

| Citizen Participation | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Content Focus** | **Type of Research** | | |
| | **Theoretical Analysis** | **Current Status** | **Relationships** |
| Nature of Community Councils<br>Nature of Citizens in the Community<br>Citizen Attitudes<br>Funding<br>Administrative Issues<br>Training of Personnel | | | |

Figure 5. Two-dimensional category system for citizen participation research area.

## CHAPTER 3

### Methods

*Instrumentation*

Once the task of developing the conceptual framework for research needs had been completed, a survey instrument was prepared. A copy of the final instrument is presented in Appendix B. The assessment of the need for research in each of the 54 research domains was of primary importance. Thus, for each research domain, respondents were asked to indicate the need for studies. A five-point scale, 1 (low) to 5 (high), was provided for the response. For clarity and ease of presentation, the 54 items were presented in three parts. Part A focused on theoretical or conceptual studies, Part B on status studies and Part C on relational studies. Each of the three parts included 18 items. These are shown in Figures 6, 7, and 8.

After rating each content area within a research type, the respondent was asked to indicate for which area of the 18 there was the greatest need for research, and for which area of the 18 there was the second greatest need for research. This provided a relative rating of the most important needs in addition to the absolute rating of each of the 18 areas for each type of research. For example, the items used to assess greatest and second greatest needs for theoretical or conceptual research were as follows:

> Please fill in the blanks to indicate for which 2 of the above 18 areas there is the greatest need for theoretical or conceptual research:
>
> The greatest need for theoretical or conceptual research is in area number _____.
>
> The second greatest need for theoretical or conceptual research is in area number _____.

Ten other items were also included on the instruments. These ten questions sought the respondent's geographical location, age, years in present position, years as a professional in community education, level of responsibility, sex, highest degree held, formal training in community education, past involvement in community education research projects, and interest in participating in community education projects (see Figure 9). These items served a dual purpose. First they allowed us to describe the respondents. Second, they allowed the possibility of determining whether different kinds of respondents perceived community education research needs differently. Specifically, in this study, there was an interest in determining whether research needs were perceived differently by community educators at different responsibility levels, in different parts of the country, with different academic degrees, or with different types of formal community education training.

**Part A: Theoretical or Conceptual Studies**

This kind of research would attempt to produce position papers or literature reviews on an area of interest. It would not include the collection of new empirical data. For example, with regard to facilities usage, the following questions might be asked: How should usage be defined? Is it the number of persons? The number of hours? The number of hours per person? How do professionals in other fields (business, sociology, organizational theory, etc.) define usage?

*DIRECTIONS:* *Rate the need, on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale, of doing* theoretical studies aimed at producing position papers or literature reviews *in the following 18 areas. Circle the number that best reflects your assessment of the need for this type of study in each area.*

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 1. Facility Cost | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Nature of Community Councils | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Use of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Nature of Citizens in the Community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Nature of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Citizen Attitudes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Nature of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Policy of Facility Usage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Funding of Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Facility Users | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Management of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Cost of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Training of Community Education Personnel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



Figure 6. Items for Part A.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Part B: Status Studies**

This kind of research would focus on what is currently happening in community education. Empirical data would be collected to answer questions about current status. For example, with regard to facility usage the following kinds of questions might be asked: How many people use community education facilities? How much of the time are these facilities used?

*DIRECTIONS:* *Rate the need on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale, of doing* studies aimed at describing the current characteristics of community education programs *for each of the following 18 areas. Circle the number that best reflects your assessment of the need for this type of study in each area.*

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 1. Facility Cost | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Nature of Community Councils | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Use of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Nature of Citizens in the Community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Nature of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Citizen Attitudes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Nature of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Policy of Facility Usage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Funding of Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Facility Users | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Management of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Cost of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Training of Community Education Personnel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Figure 7. Items for Part B.

**Part C: Relational Studies**

This kind of research would focus on relationships between variables in community education and would also involve empirical data collection. These kinds of studies would focus on questions such as the following: How do legal factors influence the costs of community education? How does the nature of the community affect usage of community education centers? Are some kinds of programs more effective in increasing usage than are other kinds of programs? Which kinds of programs affect behavior?

*DIRECTIONS:* *Rate the need, on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale, of doing* studies aimed at determining relationships between community education variables *in the following 18 areas. Circle the number that best reflects your assessment of the need for this type of study in each area.*

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 1. Facility Cost | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Nature of Community Councils | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Use of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Nature of Citizens in the Community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Nature of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Citizen Attitudes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Nature of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Policy of Facility Usage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Funding of Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Facility Users | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Management of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Cost of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Training of Community Education Personnel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



Figure 8. Items for Part C.

**Part I. Demographic Information:**

*DIRECTIONS: For items 1–4 please fill in the blanks with the necessary information.*

1. I work in _____ (state).
2. I am _____ years old.
3. I have been in my present position _____ years.
4. I have been a professional in the field of community education for a total of _____ years.

*DIRECTIONS: For items 5–10 please put a check mark in the appropriate blank.*

5. I am a Community Educator:

   ( ) a. with responsibilities at the building level.
   ( ) b. with responsibilities at the system-wide level.
   ( ) c. with responsibilities at the state level.
   ( ) d. with responsibilities at a university community education center.
   ( ) e. other _____ please specify

6. Sex: ( ) a. Male
   ( ) b. Female

7. The highest degree I hold is the:

   ( ) a. Bachelors
   ( ) b. Masters
   ( ) c. Doctorate
   ( ) d. other _____ please specify

8. My formal training in community education is:

   ( ) a. academic degree related (e.g., B.A., M.A., Ph.D.).
   ( ) b. through in-service work.
   ( ) c. short-term workshop.
   ( ) d. other _____ please specify

9. I have been involved in a community education research project before this one:

   ( ) a. yes
   ( ) b. no

10. I am interested in participating in community education research projects:

    ( ) a. yes
    ( ) b. no

Figure 9. Demographic items.

*Sampling and Data Collection Procedures*

Determination of the population to be surveyed was made jointly by Bureau and Mid-Atlantic Center project staff. The decision was made to obtain the entire mailing list of the National Community Education Association (NCEA) as this was the most readily available and comprehensive nationwide list of community educators. Project staff were aware that use of this list would result in exclusion of those community educators who were not members and that this latter group might differ from the group of members. However, there was no readily accessible list of nonmembers, and it was felt that members of the National Association might tend to be more interested in and more aware of research needs in community education. It was realized that use of this population prevents generalization to nonmember community educators.

An additional problem was encountered with the mailing lists provided by NCEA. The list included a total of 2,045 persons, but a large portion of the list represented people who were not current, full-time community educators; some were retired or no longer in the field of community education, while others were only peripherally involved in the field. In an attempt to narrow the list to those members currently involved in full-time community education work, phone calls were made to the director of at least one state center for community education development in each state. Each director was asked to identify those people on the mailing list for that state who did not belong to the target population. This resulted in a target population of 1,371 full-time community educators who were current members of the National Community Education Association. To this list was added any additional names of directors of the centers for community education development in each state—a total of 25 new names. These names were obtained from the Mott Foundation's 1979 pamphlet, "A Guide to Community Education Resources." This resulted in a final target population of 1,396. As this was a very manageable number, project staff from the Bureau and the Mid-Atlantic Center made the decision to survey the entire population. Thus, 1,396 surveys with cover letters and return envelopes were sent out in mid-February, 1980. A follow-up reminder was then sent to each target respondent at the end of the month. Due to the bulk rate mail process used, many of the original surveys were not received by the target respondents until mid-March. This first mailing and follow-up reminder resulted in a return rate of approximately 50% (700 returned). When the return rate dropped toward the end of March, a second survey was sent to all nonrespondents. This resulted in the return of approximately 235 (17%) additional surveys—for a total of 911 returned. Fifteen respondents were removed from the list after their returned surveys indicated that they were either unavailable or not really members of the target population. Some of these 15 surveys were returned as undeliverable; others were returned with notes indicating that respondents had retired, changed fields, or were only peripherally involved in community education at the present. Thus, the number of

potential respondents was reduced to 1,381. After the preliminary cutoff date was reached in mid-April and initial analyses were begun, approximately 25 (2%) additional surveys were received. These are not included in the present analysis, but they will be included in later analyses.

*Data Processing Procedures*

Data processing for the survey was done at the University of Virginia's Academic Computing Center, using *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) programs. Initial computer runs were made to produce descriptive statistics which were used to aid in "cleaning" the data by allowing for the identification of inappropriate values which resulted from respondent, coding, or keypunching errors. After the data cleaning process was complete, a second run of descriptive statistics was produced to determine demographic characteristics of respondents such as geographic location, age, sex, type of responsibility, type of formal training, and so forth.

Later computer runs included one-way analyses of variance and crosstabulations. The former task was used to determine differences in perceptions of individuals according to their community education responsibility, formal training, region, and highest degree held. Crosstabulations produced tables with information such as the number and percentage of respondents—by region—who thought, for example, that "Facility Cost" was the greatest research need. The same task also produced tables indicating, for example, the number and percentage of respondents—by responsibility—who considered "Barriers and Facilitators to Interagency Relationships" to be the second greatest research need.

## CHAPTER 4

### Results

This chapter presents the results of statistical analysis--both descriptive and inferential. Descriptive statistics are provided to describe respondent characteristics as well as to provide such summary statistics as the mean ($\bar{X}$), standard deviation (SD), and ranking for assessments of research needs. Inferential analyses were conducted to determine whether different "kinds" of community educators perceived research needs differently. In order to do these comparisons, analyses of variance were first performed and omnibus F tests calculated. Then, when the F tests were significant, multiple comparison tests were made to identify specific group differences. The fact that large numbers of these tests were made increased the likelihood of Type I errors--the likelihood of rejecting the null hypothesis when in fact it should not be rejected. The net result is that it is possible that more differences between different "kinds" of community educators were found than actually exist. Although adjustments could have been made to reduce the occurrence of Type I errors, it was decided not to make these adjustments for two reasons. First, these adjustments might actually increase the probability of Type II errors--the likelihood of failing to reject the null when it should be rejected. Second, to our knowledge there has been no research of this kind done prior to this study. It seems most appropriate then to uncover any possible differences that may exist. Where no differences are found it is pretty safe to assume that, in fact, these groups really do not differ. Where differences are found, it suggests that future research in this area on these target groups should be conducted to replicate these comparisons. Replication, although seldom done in education, is the most single important criterion for belief in research hypotheses. The differences found in this study, then, should be replicated in future studies on community education research needs.

Five sections are included in this chapter. A description of respondents, including return rates and demographic characteristics, is presented in the first section. Assessments of research needs by the total respondent sample are presented in the second section. Comparative analyses are presented in sections three through five. These include comparisons of assessments of research needs by level of responsibility, geographic location (region), degree held, and type of community education training.

*Description of the Sample*

A total of 1,396 surveys was sent nationwide--to all 50 states and the District of Columbia. This total population size was later reduced to 1,381 when 15 of the respondents returned surveys indicating that they did not actually belong to the population of interest. Reasons for removal from the target population included retirement, change of employment to a new field, peripheral involvement with community education, death. The number of surveys sent to target respondents in each state ranged from 3 in New Hampshire and Vermont to 277 in Michigan. The number of surveys returned from each state ranged from 1 in Vermont to 198 in Michigan. Return rates (reported as the percentage of those surveys sent to target respondents which were actually returned) ranged from 33.3% in Vermont (1 returned out of 3 sent) to 100% in New Hampshire (3 returned out of 3 sent). The specific numbers of surveys sent and returned, plus the return rates, are reported individually by state in Appendix C.

In this portion of the report, and throughout the remainder of the report, many results will be reported by geographical region. The eight regions, as proposed by the NCEA,are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Region I: | Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont |
| Region II: | District of Columbia, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia |
| Region III: | Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi |
| Region IV: | Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas |
| Region V: | Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio |
| Region VI: | Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin |
| Region VII: | Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah |
| Region VIII: | Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming. |

The number of surveys sent and the returns for each region are presented in Table 1. As can be seen, 911 of the 1,381 surveys sent to target respondents were returned, for an overall return rate of 66.0%. In Region I, 147 of 254 surveys were returned (57.9%); in Region II, 97 of 147 surveys were returned (66.0%); in Region III, 90 of 133 surveys were returned (67.7%); in Region IV, 90 of 134 surveys were returned (67.2%); in Region V, 239 of 338 surveys were returned (70.5%); in Region VI, 107 of 160 surveys were returned (66.9%); in Region VII, 80 of 122 surveys were returned (65.6%); and in Region VIII, 61 of 93 surveys were returned (65.6%).

Table 1

Number of Surveys Sent, Number of Surveys Returned, and Return Rate by Region

| Region | Number sent | Number returned | Return rate (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| I | 254 | 147 | 57.9 |
| II | 147 | 97 | 66.0 |
| III | 133 | 90 | 67.7 |
| IV | 134 | 90 | 67.2 |
| V | 338 | 239 | 70.5 |
| VI | 160 | 107 | 66.9 |
| VII | 122 | 80 | 65.6 |
| VIII | 93 | 61 | 65.6 |
| TOTAL | 1,381 | 911 | 66.0 |

Table 2

A Summary of Return Rates by Region Relative to Number and Percentage of Surveys Sent

| Region | Number sent | Number returned | % of total sent | % of total returns |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | 254 | 147 | 18.4 | 16.1 |
| II | 147 | 97 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| III | 133 | 90 | 9.6 | 9.9 |
| IV | 134 | 90 | 9.7 | 9.9 |
| V | 338 | 239 | 24.5 | 26.2 |
| VI | 160 | 107 | 11.6 | 11.7 |
| VII | 122 | 80 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| VIII | 93 | 61 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| TOTAL | 1,381 | 911 | 99.9* | 99.9 |

Table 3

A Summary of the Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Age Group

| Age | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 25 or under | 31 | 3.4 |
| 26 to 30 | 139 | 15.3 |
| 31 to 35 | 185 | 20.3 |
| 36 to 40 | 174 | 19.1 |
| 41 to 45 | 122 | 13.4 |
| 46 to 50 | 117 | 12.8 |
| 51 to 55 | 69 | 7.6 |
| 56 to 60 | 34 | 3.7 |
| over 60 | 20 | 2.2 |
| Unknown | 20 | 2.2 |
| TOTAL | 911 | 100.0 |

*In this table, and in tables which follow, percentages may not total to exactly 100% due to the computer function used in rounding.

It can be seen in Table 2 that the largest portion of the surveys were from respondents in Region V, which accounted for over one—fourth of the total responses. Region I returns accounted for over 15%, while Regions II and VI each accounted for over 10% of the total returns. Regions III and IV each had returns accounting for just under 10% of the total. The smallest numbers of returns came from Regions VII and VIII, with 8.8% and 6.7% respectively. These percentages of total returns conform quite closely with the percentages of persons in each region from the total sample (see "% of total sent" in Table 2).

A summary of data concerning the age of the respondents is presented in Table 3. The youngest respondent was 23 years old and the oldest was 74 years old. The mean age was 39.4 years with a standard deviation of 9.6 years. The median age, that age above which and below which 50% of the respondents fall, was 37.4 years.

The length of time that survey respondents had been professionals in the field of community education (see Table 4) ranged from less than a year (0 years) to 40 years, with the mean being 7.2 years and the standard deviation being 5.9 years. The median number of years that respondents had been professionals in community education was 5.7 years.

Respondents to the survey had worked in their present positions from less than a year (0 years) to 40 years. The mean number of years in the present position was 5.3 years, with a standard deviation of 4.7 years. The median number of years that respondents had been in their present positions was 3.9 years.

Community educators were also asked to indicate whether their responsibility was at the building level, at the system level, at the state level, at a university community education center, or "other." If respondents indicated "other," they were asked to specify their responsibility. Responses are summarized in Tables 6 and 7 and are discussed below.

Of the 911 respondents, 8 left the responsibility item blank, 822 gave a single response, 59 gave two responses, and 22 persons listed three responses. Building level responsibility was indicated by 179 respondents. Of these, 40 also indicated responsibility at the system—wide level, and of those 40, 14 further indicated responsibility at the state level, while 4 people gave "other" as a third response. Additionally, one person had building and state level responsibilities; another had building and university level responsibilities, and five people had building and "other" responsibilities.

System level responsibility was indicated by 437 respondents. Of these, 16 also had responsibilities at the state level, and of those 16, 3 people listed system, state, and university level responsibilities, and 1 person indicated that he had responsibilities at system, state, and "other" levels. Responsibilities at both the state and "other" level was indicated by 12 respondents.

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Length of Time as a Professional in the Field of Community Education

| Number of years | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Less than 1 year | 19 | 2.1 |
| 1 | 64 | 7.0 |
| 2 | 87 | 9.5 |
| 3 | 80 | 8.8 |
| 4 | 84 | 9.2 |
| 5 | 99 | 10.9 |
| 6 | 66 | 7.2 |
| 7 | 69 | 7.6 |
| 8 | 65 | 7.1 |
| 9 | 30 | 3.3 |
| 10 | 54 | 5.9 |
| 11 to 12 | 57 | 6.3 |
| 13 to 15 | 49 | 5.4 |
| 16 to 24 | 40 | 4.4 |
| 25 or more | 26 | 2.9 |
| Unknown | 22 | 2.4 |
| TOTAL | 911 | 100.0 |

Table 5

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Length of Time in Present Position

| Number of years | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Less than one | 2 | .2 |
| 1 | 162 | 17.8 |
| 2 | 139 | 15.3 |
| 3 | 113 | 12.4 |
| 4 to 5 | 154 | 16.9 |
| 6 to 7 | 135 | 14.8 |
| 8 to 9 | 62 | 6.8 |
| 10 to 14 | 90 | 9.9 |
| 15 to 19 | 18 | 2.0 |
| 20 or more | 22 | 2.3 |
| Unknown | 14 | 1.5 |
| TOTAL | 911 | 99.9 |

State level responsibility was indicated by 68 respondents. Respondents indicating state level responsibilities worked in state department jobs, on state–wide projects, or on state–wide committees. Of these respondents, 1 also listed university responsibilities, while 2 indicated both state and "other" responsibilities.

University community education center responsibilities were listed by 91 respondents. Of these respondents, 3 also had "other" responsibilities.

Of the 911 total respondents, 128 had "other" responsibilities. Frequently specified as "other" were positions such as adult education director, community college teacher, and community recreation director.

When multiple responsibilities were found to be listed by some respondents, researchers met to discuss whether these respondents should be grouped separately for subsequent data analysis tasks. It was decided that such persons would not be grouped separately but, rather, by their primary responsibility. This could be done with minimal error because persons who had minimal responsibilities at one level (e.g., state committee membership) would list them as well as their area of primary responsibility. For example, superintendents of schools in many cases checked responsibilities at building, system and state levels. Therefore, multiple responses were collapsed into areas of primary responsibility (see Table 7). The resulting figures for level of responsibility were: 179 (19.6%) at the building level, 437 (48.0%) at the system level, 68 (7.5%) at the state level, 91 (10.0%) at the university community education center level, and 128 (14.1%) with "other" responsibilities.

Approximately 70% (642) of the respondents were male, while approximately 28% (259) were female. The remaining respondents (10) did not indicate their sex.

Slightly over half (55.1% or 502) of the respondents hold masters degrees, while 15.9% (145) hold bachelors degrees and 19.6% (179) hold doctorate degrees. The remaining 85 respondents (9.3%) either did not indicate their highest degree or held degrees other than the bachelors, masters, or doctorate.

Slightly over half (51% or 465) of the respondents had academic degree related training in community education. Another 32.6% (297) received training in community education through in-service work and 7.2% (66) through short-term workshops. The remaining 83 respondents (9.1%) had other types of training or did not specify the type of training they had received in the field of community education.

Approximately 61% (555) of the respondents had previously been involved in community education research projects while another 38% (345) indicated that they had not. Approximately 80% (734) of the respondents indicated an interest in participating in community education research projects, while only about 15% (136) indicated that they were not interested.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents Indicating Specific Levels of Responsibility

| Responsibility* | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1(only) | 132 | 14.5 |
| 1, 2 (only) | 22 | 2.4 |
| 1, 2, 3 | 14 | 1.5 |
| 1, 2, 5 | 4 | .4 |
| 1, 3 | 1 | .1 |
| 1, 4 | 1 | .1 |
| 1, 5 | 5 | .5 |
| 2 (only) | 409 | 44.9 |
| 2, 3 (only) | 12 | 1.3 |
| 2, 3, 4 | 3 | .3 |
| 2, 3, 5 | 1 | .1 |
| 2, 5 | 12 | 1.3 |
| 3 (only) | 65 | 7.1 |
| 3, 4 | 1 | .1 |
| 3, 5 | 2 | .2 |
| 4 (only) | 88 | 9.7 |
| 4, 5 | 3 | .3 |
| 5 (only) | 128 | 14.1 |
| Unknown | 8 | .9 |
| TOTAL | 911 | 99.8 |

* 1 = building level, 2 = system level, 3 = state level, 4 = university community education center level, 5 = "other."

Table 7

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Primary Level of Responsibility

| Primary level of Responsibility | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Building | 179 | 19.6 |
| System | 437 | 48.0 |
| State | 68 | 7.5 |
| University Community Education Center | 91 | 10.0 |
| Other | 128 | 14.1 |
| Unknown | 8 | .8 |
| TOTAL | 911 | 100.0 |

Table 8

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Highest Degree Held

| Degree | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelors | 145 | 15.9 |
| Masters | 502 | 55.1 |
| Doctorate | 179 | 19.6 |
| Other | 76 | 8.3 |
| Unknown | 9 | 1.0 |
| TOTAL | 911 | 99.9 |

Table 9

Frequency and Percentage of Respondents by Type of Formal Training in Community Education

| Type of Training | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Academic Degree Related | 465 | 51.0 |
| In-service Work | 297 | 32.6 |
| Short-term Workshop | 66 | 7.2 |
| Other | 75 | 8.2 |
| Unknown | 8 | .9 |
| TOTAL | 911 | 99.9 |

*Rating of Research Needs: Total Sample*

Means ($\bar{X}$), standard deviations (SD), and rankings of the ratings by the total respondent sample of the need for each type of research (status, theoretical, and relational) in each content area are presented in Table 10. Since the primary purpose of this research is to identify key research needs, the separation of content into the areas of Facility Use, Citizen Participation, and Interagency Relationships is not made in the remainder of this report. The focus is on the 18 content subareas by type of research rather than on the three general areas. The lowest mean rating of the 54 ratings was in the need for Theoretical research about Nature of Facilities. This mean rating was 2.94, just below the midpoint of 3.00 on the 5-point scale. The highest mean rating (3.99) was for the need for Relational research on Citizen Attitudes. Standard deviations ranged from .99 to 1.45 with an average standard deviation of 1.11.

It may be useful here, before proceeding, to remind the reader of the meanings of the terms "Status," "Theoretical," and "Relational," as used in the survey. Status studies were defined in the survey as follows:

> This kind of research would focus on what is currently happending in community education. Empirical data would be collected to answer questions about current status. For example, with regard to facility usage the following kinds of questions might be asked: How many people use community education facilities? How much of the time are the facilities used?

Theoretical studies were defined in the survey in the following manner:

> This kind of research would attempt to produce position papers or literature reviews on an area of interest. It would not include the collection of new empirical data. For example, with regard to facilities usage, the following questions might be asked: How should usage be defined? Is it the number of persons? The number of hours? The number of hours per person? How do professionals in other fields (business, sociology, organizational theory, etc.) define usage?

Relational studies were defined in the survey as follows:

> This kind of research would focus on relationships between variables in community education and would also involve empirical data collection. These kinds of studies would focus on questions such as the following: How do legal factors influence the costs of community education? How does the nature of the community affect usage of community education centers? Are some kinds of programs more effective in increasing usage than are other kinds of programs? Which kinds of programs affect behavior?

*Status Studies.*

Community educators perceive Citizen Attitudes as the area most needing Status research. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships was ranked second, while Training of Community Education Personnel was ranked third. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships was the fourth highest Status research need, Use of Facilities was fifth, and Nature of Interagency Relationships was sixth.

Table 10

*Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for Each Content Area by Type of Research for the Total Sample**

| | Status Research | | | Theoretical Research | | | Relational Research | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | X̄ | SD | Rank | X̄ | SD | Rank | X̄ | SD | Rank |
| Citizen Attitudes | 3.90 | 1.06 | 1 | 3.85 | 1.04 | 2 | 3.99 | 1.00 | 1 |
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.83 | 1.10 | 2 | 3.96 | 1.03 | 1 | 3.89 | 1.01 | 2 |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.78 | 1.12 | 3 | 3.83 | 1.13 | 3 | 3.72 | 1.14 | 4 |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.68 | 1.05 | 4 | 3.82 | 1.02 | 4 | 3.63 | 1.07 | 7 |
| Use of Facilities | 3.67 | 1.09 | 5 | 3.68 | 1.12 | 9 | 3.68 | 1.10 | 10 |
| Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.65 | 1.03 | 6 | 3.67 | 1.04 | 5 | 3.76 | .99 | 3 |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 3.61 | 1.12 | 7 | 3.62 | 1.10 | 7 | 3.64 | 1.13 | 6 |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 3.58 | 1.11 | 8 | 3.64 | 1.07 | 6 | 3.61 | 1.12 | 8.5 |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 3.56 | 1.06 | 9 | 3.61 | 1.05 | 8 | 3.61 | 1.09 | 8.5 |
| Facility Cost | 3.55 | 1.25 | 10 | 3.29 | 1.32 | 15 | 3.41 | 1.26 | 15.5 |
| Policy of Facility Usage | 3.53 | 1.12 | 11.5 | 3.45 | 1.14 | 12 | 3.49 | 1.13 | 14 |
| Cost of Interagency Relationships | 3.53 | 1.10 | 11.5 | 3.41 | 1.11 | 13 | 3.56 | 1.07 | 11 |
| Nature of Community Councils | 3.49 | 1.12 | 13 | 3.54 | 1.45 | 10 | 3.54 | 1.14 | 12 |
| Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 3.48 | 1.08 | 14 | 3.36 | 1.13 | 14 | 3.51 | 1.06 | 13 |
| Nature of Citizens in the Community | 3.46 | 1.16 | 15 | 3.47 | 1.16 | 11 | 3.69 | 1.10 | 5 |
| Management of Facilities | 3.38 | 1.09 | 16 | 3.24 | 1.12 | 16 | 3.35 | 1.07 | 17 |
| Facility Users | 3.35 | 1.10 | 17 | 3.14 | 1.07 | 17 | 3.41 | 1.11 | 15.5 |
| Nature of Facilities | 3.10 | 1.09 | 18 | 2.94 | 1.06 | 18 | 3.13 | 1.07 | 18 |

*The figures given in this table, and those which follow, are based on a 5-point rating scale.





BEST COPY AVAILABLE

At the bottom of the Status needs rankings (18th) was Nature of Facilities. Next to last (17th) was Facility Users, while Management of Facilities was 16th. Nature of Citizens in the Community was 15th, while Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships and Nature of Community Councils were 14th and 13th, respectively.

*Theoretical Studies.*

The Theoretical research need perceived as most important was Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships. Citizen Attitudes was seen as the next most important. Training of Community Education Personnel was rated third, and Evaluation of Interagency Relationships was fourth. Nature of Interagency Relationships and Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships were rated fifth and sixth, respectively.

Nature of Facilities was viewed as being the least important (18th) Theoretical research need, while Facility Users was 17th. Management of Facilities was 16th; the next three lowest, 15th through 13th, were Facility Cost, Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships, and Cost of Interagency Relationships.

*Relational Studies.*

The most important Relational research need perceived by community educators was Citizen Attitudes. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships was the second ranked need. Nature of Interagency Relationships was third, and Training of Community Education Personnel was fourth. Nature of Citizens in the Community and Funding of Citizen Participation were fifth and sixth, respectively.

Those needs perceived as being of least importance in Relational research, from 18th through 13th, respectively, were as follows: Nature of Facilities, Management of Facilities, Facility Users, Facility Cost, Policy of Facility Usage, and Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships.

*Summary.*

Citizen Attitudes was perceived as the most important Status and Relational research need, and as the second most important Theoretical need. Top ranked in the latter category was Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, which was ranked second for Status and Relational research needs. Training of Community Education Personnel was perceived as being third most important in Theoretical and Status research, and fourth in Relational research needs. Nature of Interagency Relationships ranked third in that category, and ranked fifth and sixth in Theoretical and Status research needs, respectively. The need rated as fourth most important in Theoretical and Status research was Evaluation of Interagency Relationships.

Nature of Facilities was rated last (18th) for each of the three types of research. Facility Users was viewed as next-to-least-important (rated 17th) in Theoretical and Status research, and was tied for 15th in Relational research. Management of Facilities was ranked

17th in the latter area, while it was 16th in Theoretical and Status research. Facility Cost and Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships were also considered to be relatively low in importance across the three types of research.

One curious result emerged. Nature of Citizens in the Community was ranked fifth as a Relational research need, 11th as a Theoretical need, and 15th as a Status research need. Apparently Nature of Citizens is considered an area worthy of research when placed in the context of a relationship with other factors.

Table 11 presents means, standard deviations, and rankings of the 15 areas (out of the total of 54 areas) having the highest rated need for research as perceived by the total respondent sample. The areas of Citizen Attitudes and Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships appear highest, and they were perceived to need research of all three types—Status, Theoretical, and Relational.

*Greatest and Second Greatest Need: Total Sample*

In order to get additional information, and to check on the absolute ratings, respondents were asked to indicate the area for which they felt there was the greatest need and the area for which they felt there was the second greatest need for research, under each type of research. These results are summarized in Tables 12 and 13. Entries are made in these tables for areas chosen by at least 50 respondents. The results are very consistent with the absolute ratings discussed previously. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, Citizen Attitudes, and Training of Community Education Personnel again surface as the most needed research areas.

*Ratings of Research Needs by Selected Groups*

At this point, a fairly clear delineation of the most desired research areas has emerged. The respondents, as a total group, most value research into the areas of Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relations, Citizen Attitudes and Training of Community Education Personnel. This may not hold, however, for specific subgroups of community educators. Those with responsibilities at the building or system level, for example, may view the needs differently than community educators having responsibilities at university centers. People from different parts of the country, or those with different types of training in community education may also view the needs differently. The remainder of the results section deals with this possibility. The reader is once again reminded that the statistical tests employed for these analyses may overestimate the number of true differences between these groups. The major emphasis in these sections will be on the five or six areas rated highest by the total group of respondents.

*Rating of Research Needs by Responsibility Level*

*Status Studies.*

13

As can be seen in Table 14, 14 of the 18 omnibus F tests were significant ($p < .05$).

Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations, and Rankings
of the Fifteen Areas Having the Highest Rated Need for Research

| Area | $\bar{x}$ | SD | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| Relational Research on Citizen Attitudes | 3.99 | 1.00 | 1 |
| Theoretical Research on Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.96 | 1.03 | 2 |
| Status Research on Citizen Attitudes | 3.90 | 1.06 | 3 |
| Relational Research on Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.89 | 1.01 | 4 |
| Theoretical Research on Citizen Attitudes | 3.85 | 1.04 | 5 |
| Status Research on Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.83 | 1.10 | 6.5 |
| Theoretical Research on Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.83 | 1.13 | 6.5 |
| Theoretical Research on the Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.82 | 1.02 | 8 |
| Relational Research on the Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.76 | .99 | 9.5 |
| Status Research on Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.76 | 1.12 | 9.5 |
| Relational Research on Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.72 | 1.14 | 11 |
| Relational Research on Nature of Citizens in the Community | 3.69 | 1.10 | 12 |
| Status Research on the Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.68 | 1.05 | 13 |
| Theoretical Research on the Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.67 | 1.04 | 14.5 |
| Status Research on Use of Facilities | 3.67 | 1.09 | 14.5 |

Table 12

Areas Mentioned Most Often as Having the Greatest Research Need for Status, Theoretical, and Relational Research*

| Content Area | TYPE OF RESEARCH | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Status | | Theoretical | | Relational | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 93 | 10.2 | 141 | 15.5 | 97 | 10.6 |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 85 | 9.3 | 113 | 12.4 | 76 | 8.3 |
| Citizen Attitudes | 83 | 9.1 | 71 | 7.8 | 88 | 9.7 |
| Facility Cost | 79 | 8.7 | 69 | 7.6 | 52 | 5.7 |
| Nature of Community Councils | -- | -- | 61 | 6.7 | -- | -- |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 77 | 8.5 | 52 | 5.7 | 70 | 7.7 |
| Nature of Citizens in the Community | -- | -- | 56 | 6.1 | 62 | 6.8 |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | -- | -- | 58 | 6.4 | -- | -- |
| Use of Facilities | 55 | 6.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 63 | 6.9 | -- | -- | 53 | 5.8 |
| TOTALS | 535 | 58.7 | 621 | 68.2 | 498 | 54.6 |

Table 13

Areas Mentioned Most Often as Having the Second Greatest Research Need for Status, Theoretical, and Relational Research*

| Content Area | TYPE OF RESEARCH | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Status | | Theoretical | | Relational | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 87 | 9.5 | 88 | 9.7 | 75 | 8.2 |
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 65 | 7.1 | 80 | 8.8 | 67 | 7.4 |
| Citizen Attitudes | 79 | 8.7 | 75 | 8.2 | 77 | 8.5 |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 69 | 7.6 | 57 | 6.3 | 53 | 5.8 |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 54 | 5.9 | 69 | 7.6 | 57 | 6.3 |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | -- | -- | 67 | 7.4 | -- | -- |
| Nature of Citizens in the Community | -- | -- | -- | -- | 50 | 5.5 |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | -- | -- | 62 | 6.8 | 51 | 5.6 |
| TOTALS | 354 | 38.8 | 498 | 54.8 | 430 | 47.3 |

*Entries are included only for those areas indicated by at least 50 respondents.

## Table 14

A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Status Research Needs Among Persons with Differing Responsibility Levels

| CONTENT AREA | Total $\bar{x}$ | Total SD | (1) Building $\bar{x}$ | (1) Building SD | (2) System $\bar{x}$ | (2) System SD | (3) State $\bar{x}$ | (3) State SD | (4) University $\bar{x}$ | (4) University SD | (5) Other $\bar{x}$ | (5) Other SD | F | df | Scheffé results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Citizen Attitude | 3.90 | 1.06 | 4.11 | .89 | 3.87 | 1.05 | 3.64 | 1.29 | 3.72 | 1.11 | 3.94 | 1.06 | 3.52** | 4,855 | $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_4$ |
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.83 | 1.10 | 3.71 | 1.00 | 3.70 | 1.17 | 4.18 | .94 | 3.98 | 1.04 | 4.15 | 1.00 | 6.69*** | 4,857 | $\bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_5 > \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2$ |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.76 | 1.12 | 3.85 | 1.07 | 3.68 | 1.12 | 3.53 | 1.19 | 3.90 | 1.09 | 3.97 | 1.10 | 3.00* | 4,855 | No Pairwise Differences |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.68 | 1.05 | 3.63 | 1.06 | 3.56 | 1.09 | 3.94 | .98 | 3.85 | .91 | 3.91 | .95 | 4.68** | 4,852 | No Pairwise Differences |
| Use of Facilities | 3.67 | 1.09 | 3.68 | 1.07 | 3.76 | 1.04 | 3.94 | 1.01 | 3.34 | 1.19 | 3.46 | 1.19 | 5.08*** | 4,855 | $\bar{x}_3 > \bar{x}_4, \bar{x}_5, \bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_4$ |
| Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.65 | 1.03 | 3.69 | .93 | 3.52 | 1.07 | 3.85 | .97 | 3.64 | .99 | 3.93 | 1.04 | 4.70*** | 4,849 | $\bar{x}_5 > \bar{x}_2$ |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 3.61 | 1.12 | 3.71 | 1.10 | 3.63 | 1.10 | 3.39 | 1.11 | 3.64 | 1.13 | 3.50 | 1.22 | 1.35ns | 4,853 | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 3.58 | 1.11 | 3.48 | 1.12 | 3.50 | 1.08 | 4.04 | 1.04 | 3.76 | 1.08 | 3.61 | 1.19 | 4.46** | 4,852 | $\bar{x}_3 > \bar{x}_1, x_2$ |
| Adminstrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 3.56 | 1.06 | 3.53 | 1.03 | 3.49 | 1.04 | 3.72 | 1.13 | 3.87 | 1.01 | 3.52 | 1.14 | 2.70* | 4,855 | $\bar{x}_4 > \bar{x}_2$ |
| Facility Cost | 3.55 | 1.25 | 3.51 | 1.22 | 3.54 | 1.25 | 3.90 | 1.16 | 3.71 | 1.21 | 3.31 | 1.34 | 2.85* | 4,857 | $\bar{x}_3 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Policy of Facility Usage | 3.53 | 1.12 | 3.52 | 1.07 | 3.57 | 1.10 | 3.72 | 1.01 | 3.61 | 1.13 | 3.22 | 1.23 | 3.05* | 4,853 | $\bar{x}_3 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Cost of Interagency Relationships | 3.53 | 1.10 | 3.49 | 1.10 | 3.46 | 1.02 | 3.75 | 1.22 | 3.78 | 1.21 | 3.56 | 1.17 | 2.31ns | 4,855 | No Differences |
| Nature of Community Councils | 3.49 | 1.12 | 3.68 | .99 | 3.36 | 1.16 | 3.42 | 1.11 | 3.66 | 1.15 | 3.58 | 1.13 | 3.33* | 4,854 | $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_2$ |
| Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 3.48 | 1.08 | 3.43 | 1.04 | 3.41 | 1.07 | 3.66 | 1.11 | 3.55 | 1.15 | 3.62 | 1.09 | 1.59ns | 4,854 | No Differences |
| Nature of Citizens in Community | 3.46 | 1.16 | 3.72 | 1.06 | 3.36 | 1.15 | 3.12 | 1.28 | 3.42 | 1.13 | 3.66 | 1.17 | 5.18*** | 4,846 | $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_5 > \bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_2$ |
| Management of Facilities | 3.38 | 1.09 | 3.55 | .95 | 3.46 | 1.07 | 3.17 | 1.12 | 3.18 | 1.10 | 3.13 | 1.24 | 4.68*** | 4,854 | $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Facility Users | 3.35 | 1.10 | 3.55 | 1.04 | 3.44 | 1.08 | 3.09 | 1.15 | 3.17 | 1.09 | 3.03 | 1.13 | 6.42*** | 4,855 | $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_5$ |
| Nature of Facilities | 3.10 | 1.09 | 3.17 | 1.04 | 3.15 | 1.05 | 3.00 | 1.17 | 2.93 | 1.04 | 2.97 | 1.26 | 1.54ns | 4,851 | No Differences |

ns: not significant
*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$
***: $p < .001$

Omnibus F tests were not significant for Status research on Nature of Facilities, Funding of Citizen Participation, Cost of Interagency Relationships, or Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships. None of these areas were included in the six highest ratings given by the total respondent group for Status research needs. Four other areas can be somewhat ignored here also since they were not rated highly by the total group or by any subgroup. These are Policy of Facility Usage, Nature of Community Councils, Management of Facilities, and Facility Users. Differences between groups were found for the ten remaining areas, *and* each was either highly rated by the total group or by at least one subgroup. Although Nature of Citizens in the Community ranked only 15th in the total group ratings, it was rated higher by building level respondents, for whom it ranked 3rd, and by "other" respondents, for whom it was ranked 6th. The total group rating of Facility Cost ranked 10th while that of Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships was ranked 8th. Each of these was rated higher by state level respondents than by those with responsibilities at any other level. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships was ranked 2nd by state level respondents while Facility Cost ranked 5th. While the rating for Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation was ranked 9th for the total group of respondents, university respondents perceived a much higher need for research in this area. It was ranked 3rd by university respondent ratings. While Nature of Interagency Relationships had the 6th highest rating for the total respondent group, the group referred to as "other" rated it 4th while system level respondents rated it only 9th. Use of Facilities, which ranked 5th overall, was rated higher by building level (rank = 2) and state level (rank = 3.5) respondents but much lower by university level (rank = 15) and "other" respondents (rank = 13). With only a few exceptions, there is much more agreement about the need for Status research in the areas rated highest (top 4) by the total group of respondents. The fourth highest rated area for the total group was Evaluation of Interagency Relationships. Although there was some within-group ranking differences, the mean ratings for the groups were not statistically different. The overall rating for Training of Community Education Personnel ranked third. Subgroup ratings were quite high for this area, except for state level respondents (rank = 12 for this group). Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, the 2nd highest rated area for the total group, was also rated highly by all five subgroups. The significant group differences occurred mainly as a result of the very high ratings given by the state level and "other" respondents. Citizen Attitudes received the highest overall ratings. Group differences occurred here because state and university level respondents rated this area lower, particularly in relation to building level respondents.

A brief review might be useful at this point. Analyses of the ratings provided by the total group of respondents of needs for Status research suggest that research is most needed in the areas of Citizen Attitudes, Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, and Training

of Community Education Personnel. Analyses by responsibility level of the respondent shed a slightly different light. While all five groups viewed Status research concerning Barriers/ Facilitators to Interagency Relationships as much needed, state and university respondents placed a lower value than did other respondent groups on the need for Status research on Citizen Attitudes, and state level respondents placed a lower value than did other respondent groups on Status research concerning Training of Community Education Personnel. Rather, state level respondents saw a greater need for Status research on Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships, Evaluation of Interagency Relationships, and Use of Facilities and university respondents saw a greater need for Status research on Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation.

*Theoretical studies.*

Results of one-way analyses of variance and Scheffé tests to determine differences in perceptions of Theoretical research needs among persons with different levels of responsibility are summarized in Table 15. Of the 18 omnibus F tests, 11 were statistically significant ($p<.05$). The groups did not differ on their ratings of the need for Theoretical research in the following 7 areas: Citizen Attitudes, Nature of Interagency Relationships, Funding of Citizen Participation, Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships, Cost of Interagency Relationships, Policy of Facility Usage, and Facility Users. Although differences were found between subgroups, none of the following four content areas were rated highly by the total group or by any subgroup: Nature of Facilities, Facility Users, Management of Facilities, and Facility Cost. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships was generally not rated highly as a Theoretical research need (rank = 14), but it was rated 5th highest for state level respondents. The need rating for Nature of Citizens in the Community was ranked 11th for the total group but 5th for building level respondents and 15th for state level respondents. University level respondents rated Nature of Community Councils higher (rank = 5) than other groups or the total group (rank = 10), while system level people rated Use of Facilities higher (rank = 5) than other groups or the total sample (rank = 9). The 8th ranked area for the total sample was Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation. Only the rating for university respondents was ranked higher than this (rank = 2). The four areas rated highest by the total group were Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationship (1st), Citizen Attitudes (2nd), Training of Community Education Personnel (3rd), and Evaluation of Interagency Relationships (4th). In general, all five groups rated each of these areas fairly high. The "other" group rated Evaluation of Interagency Relationship higher than building level and system level respondents. The state level respondents rated Training of Community Education Personnel lower than did "other" or building level people (It was only 13th in rank for the state level people). Citizen Attitudes was not rated differently by the five groups. Finally, "other" respondents rated Barriers/Facilitators to

## Table 15

A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Theoretical Research Needs Among Persons with Differing Responsibility Levels

| CONTENT AREA | Total $\bar{X}$ | Total SD | LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY (1) Building $\bar{X}$ | (1) Building SD | (2) System $\bar{X}$ | (2) System SD | (3) State $\bar{X}$ | (3) State SD | (4) University $\bar{X}$ | (4) University SD | (5) Other $\bar{X}$ | (5) Other SD | F | df | Scheffé results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.69 | 1.03 | 3.84 | 1.08 | 3.88 | 1.07 | 4.15 | .86 | 4.10 | .86 | 4.21 | .93 | 4.24** | 4,875 | $x_5 > x_1, x_2$ |
| Citizen Attitudes | 3.85 | 1.04 | 3.84 | 1.06 | 3.91 | 1.01 | 3.66 | 1.19 | 3.68 | 1.02 | 3.89 | 1.03 | 1.59ns | 4,873 | No Differences |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.83 | 1.13 | 3.98 | 1.06 | 3.77 | 1.13 | 3.46 | 1.16 | 3.92 | 1.14 | 3.98 | 1.12 | 3.65** | 4,873 | $x_5, x_1 > x_3$ |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.82 | 1.02 | 3.73 | 1.05 | 3.75 | 1.04 | 3.89 | .95 | 3.92 | 1.00 | 4.07 | .94 | 3.02* | 4,875 | $x_5 > x_1, x_2$ |
| Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.67 | 1.04 | 3.64 | 1.08 | 3.61 | 1.04 | 3.74 | .94 | 3.74 | 1.04 | 3.85 | 1.01 | 1.47ns | 4,873 | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 3.64 | 1.07 | 3.52 | 1.10 | 3.60 | 1.09 | 3.84 | .95 | 3.84 | .96 | 3.66 | 1.09 | 2.04ns | 4,874 | No Differences |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 3.62 | 1.10 | 3.60 | 1.03 | 3.64 | 1.08 | 3.42 | 1.21 | 3.68 | 1.20 | 3.61 | 1.12 | .70ns | 4,872 | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 3.61 | 1.05 | 3.45 | 1.03 | 3.60 | 1.03 | 3.57 | 1.14 | 4.06 | .87 | 3.53 | 1.10 | 5.40** | 4,874 | $x_4 > x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5$ |
| Use of Facilities | 3.58 | 1.12 | 3.51 | 1.12 | 3.70 | 1.08 | 3.67 | 1.10 | 3.30 | 1.25 | 3.37 | 1.12 | 3.98** | 4,871 | $x_2 > x_4, x_5$ |
| Nature of Community Councils | 3.54 | 1.45 | 3.61 | 1.09 | 3.43 | 1.21 | 3.52 | 1.11 | 3.86 | 1.04 | 3.56 | 1.06 | 2.96* | 4,872 | $x_4 > x_2$ |
| Nature of Citizens in the Community | 3.47 | 1.16 | 3.68 | 1.11 | 3.43 | 1.15 | 3.09 | 1.14 | 3.43 | 1.21 | 3.57 | 1.21 | 3.50** | 4,863 | $x_1 > x_3$ |
| Policy of Facility Usage | 3.45 | 1.14 | 3.41 | 1.14 | 3.50 | 1.16 | 3.59 | .94 | 3.49 | 1.13 | 3.21 | 1.15 | 1.91ns | 4,871 | No Differences |
| Cost of Interagency Relationships | 3.41 | 1.11 | 3.30 | 1.09 | 3.37 | 1.08 | 3.61 | 1.14 | 3.63 | 1.08 | 3.44 | 1.19 | 1.99ns | 4,869 | No Differences |
| Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 3.36 | 1.13 | 3.24 | 1.15 | 3.33 | 1.16 | 3.71 | .96 | 3.38 | 1.07 | 3.47 | 1.11 | 2.50* | 4,871 | $x_3 > x_1$ |
| Facility Cost | 3.29 | 1.32 | 3.13 | 1.24 | 3.37 | 1.29 | 3.61 | 1.34 | 3.32 | 1.37 | 3.05 | 1.39 | 3.05* | 4,867 | $x_3 > x_5$ |
| Management of Facilities | 3.24 | 1.12 | 3.28 | 1.08 | 3.36 | 1.10 | 2.94 | .92 | 3.09 | 1.20 | 3.01 | 1.21 | 4.28* | 4,872 | $x_2 > x_3, x_5$ |
| Facility Users | 3.14 | 1.07 | 3.20 | 1.05 | 3.19 | 1.03 | 3.08 | 1.13 | 2.92 | 1.10 | 3.04 | 1.14 | 1.67ns | 4,871 | No Differences |
| Nature of Facilities | 2.94 | 1.06 | 2.89 | .97 | 3.05 | 1.08 | 2.85 | 1.06 | 2.73 | 1.11 | 2.85 | 1.07 | 2.52* | 4,865 | No Pairwise Differences |

ns: not significant
*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$
***: $p < .001$

Interagency Relationships higher than did building level or system level respondents.

In sum, the four areas seen by the total group as having the greatest need for theoretical research were also viewed that way by all five subgroups, with only one exception. State level persons did not see as great a need for Theoretical research on the Training of Community Education Personnel. They would have replaced it with Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships.

*Relational studies.*

Results on one-way analyses of variance and Scheffé tests to determine differences between responsibility level groups in perceptions of the need for relational research are shown in Table I6. No differences were found in the following four content areas: Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships, Policy of Facility Usage, Facility Cost, and Citizen Attitudes (the top rated need area for relational research). Eight content areas were not rated highly by the total group of respondents nor by any specific group of respondents. Thus, while some group differences were found, in these areas they are not relevant for this report since none of the areas is perceived as a high research need area. These eight areas are Nature of Facilities, Management of Facilities, Facility Users, Facility Cost, Policy of Facility Usage, Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships, Nature of Community Councils, and Cost of Interagency Relationships. Use of Facilities was ranked tenth in rating by the total sample. Although the omnibus F test was statistically significant, no specific group differences (Scheffé tests) were found. The total sample ratings for Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships and Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation tied for next in rank (rank = 8.5). While no specific group differences (Scheffé tests) were found for Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships, university respondents tended to rate the need for relational research on Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation higher than did system level respondents. This was the 5th highest rating for university level respondents. The omnibus F for the seventh ranked area, Evaluation of Interagency Relationships, was statistically significant but, again, no specific group differences were found. Funding of Citizen Participation (overall rank = 6) was viewed as an area less in need of relational research by state level people than by university and system level people. State level respondents also viewed Nature of Citizens in the Community (overall rank = 5) as less in need of research than did building level people. Although state level respondents did not appear to see as much need for Relational research on Training of Community Education Personnel (overall rank = 4) as did other respondents, this specific group difference was not statistically significant. The total group ratings for Citizen Attitudes, Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, and Nature of Interagency Relationships were ranked 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, respectively, in terms of the need for Relational research. No dramatic group differences were found in these ratings of needs.

## Table 16

A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Relational Research Needs Among Persons with Differing Responsibility Levels

| CONTENT AREA | Total $\bar{X}$ | Total SD | LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY (1) Building $\bar{X}$ | (1) Building SD | (2) System $\bar{X}$ | (2) System SD | (3) State $\bar{X}$ | (3) State SD | (4) University $\bar{X}$ | (4) University SD | (5) Other $\bar{X}$ | (5) Other SD | F | df | Scheffé results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Citizen Attitudes | 3.99 | 1.00 | 4.13 | .87 | 3.93 | 1.04 | 3.89 | .98 | 4.05 | 1.03 | 4.05 | 1.05 | 1.45ns | 4,847 | No Differences |
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.89 | 1.01 | 3.84 | 1.00 | 3.73 | 1.02 | 4.28 | .87 | 4.19 | .87 | 4.10 | 1.05 | 8.62*** | 4,851 | $\bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_4, \bar{x}_5 > \bar{x}_2; \bar{x}_3 > \bar{x}_1$ |
| Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.76 | .99 | 3.82 | .97 | 3.66 | .99 | 3.95 | .86 | 3.94 | 1.03 | 3.81 | 1.02 | 2.67* | 4,842 | No Differences |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.72 | 1.14 | 3.80 | 1.03 | 3.61 | 1.16 | 3.53 | 1.27 | 3.95 | 1.14 | 3.92 | 1.11 | 3.48** | 4,848 | No Differences |
| Nature of Citizens in the Community | 3.69 | 1.10 | 3.84 | 1.00 | 3.70 | 1.01 | 3.35 | 1.09 | 3.59 | 1.21 | 3.70 | 1.09 | 2.54* | 4,843 | $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_3$ |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 3.64 | 1.13 | 3.63 | 1.09 | 3.66 | 1.10 | 3.23 | 1.21 | 3.83 | 1.10 | 3.65 | 1.20 | 2.81* | 4,844 | $\bar{x}_4, \bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_3$ |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.63 | 1.07 | 3.59 | 1.04 | 3.54 | 1.08 | 3.92 | 1.05 | 3.79 | 1.06 | 3.69 | 1.06 | 2.68* | 4,845 | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 3.61 | 1.12 | 3.59 | 1.05 | 3.54 | 1.10 | 3.96 | 1.12 | 3.86 | 1.12 | 3.52 | 1.22 | 3.32* | 4,849 | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 3.61 | 1.09 | 3.60 | 1.03 | 3.53 | 1.09 | 3.74 | 1.14 | 3.91 | 1.05 | 3.60 | 1.15 | 2.50* | 4,849 | $\bar{x}_4 > \bar{x}_2$ |
| Use of Facilities | 3.58 | 1.10 | 3.68 | 1.05 | 3.67 | 1.02 | 3.71 | 1.02 | 3.25 | 1.19 | 3.32 | 1.27 | 4.96*** | 4,843 | No Differences |
| Cost of Interagency Relationships | 3.56 | 1.07 | 3.58 | 1.02 | 3.45 | 1.05 | 3.77 | 1.16 | 3.88 | 1.05 | 3.60 | 1.12 | 3.83** | 4,844 | $\bar{x}_4 > \bar{x}_2$ |
| Nature of Community Councils | 3.54 | 1.14 | 3.80 | 1.13 | 3.37 | 1.09 | 3.53 | 1.28 | 3.87 | 1.07 | 3.55 | 1.19 | 6.46*** | 4,840 | $\bar{x}_4, \bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_2$ |
| Type of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 3.51 | 1.06 | 3.53 | .97 | 3.42 | 1.08 | 3.73 | .99 | 3.59 | 1.19 | 3.65 | 1.04 | 2.11ns | 4,849 | No Differences |
| Policy of Facility Usage | 3.49 | 1.13 | 3.58 | .97 | 3.48 | 1.14 | 3.62 | 1.13 | 3.46 | 1.18 | 3.35 | 1.22 | .99ns | 4,845 | No Differences |
| Facility Cost | 3.41 | 1.26 | 3.52 | 1.17 | 3.41 | 1.20 | 3.68 | 1.31 | 3.35 | 1.38 | 3.17 | 1.43 | 2.24ns | 4,842 | No Differences |
| Facility Users | 3.41 | 1.11 | 3.64 | 1.01 | 3.46 | 1.10 | 3.33 | 1.17 | 3.23 | 1.04 | 3.09 | 1.18 | 5.22*** | 4,845 | $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_4, \bar{x}_5; \bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Management of Facilities | 3.35 | 1.07 | 3.55 | .95 | 3.40 | 1.08 | 3.14 | 1.04 | 3.07 | 1.08 | 3.21 | 1.13 | 4.40** | 4,843 | $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_4$ |
| Nature of Facilities | 3.13 | 1.07 | 3.26 | .99 | 3.20 | 1.03 | 3.02 | 1.11 | 2.85 | 1.10 | 2.98 | 1.21 | 3.33* | 4,844 | $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_4$ |

ns: not significant
*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$
***: $p < .001$

*Rating of Research Needs by Region*

The second set of comparisons made was between research need ratings of respondents from different geographic regions of the country. These analyses are summarized in Tables 17, 18, and 19. Note that these regions are those proposed by NCEA. The specific states making up each region may be found in Appendix B. Of the 54 analyses of variance completed 28 resulted in nonsignificant omnibus F tests while 26 were statistically significant. Scheffé tests were run to determine specific subgroup differences where the omnibus F tests were significant. Only 9 of these yielded specific pairwise differences. Of these, 3 were with regard to Status research needs, 1 was related to Theoretical research needs, and 5 were on Relational research needs. In 7 of the 9 differences, the mean of the Mid-Atlantic region respondents was higher (the need was perceived to be greater) than that of the Northwest and Alaska region or the Great Lakes region.

*Status Studies*

The only pairwise differences relative to Status research needs (see Table 17) were for the areas of Facility Cost, Nature of Facilities, and Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation. Mid-Atlantic region respondents rated the need for Status research on Facility Costs and Nature of Facilities higher than did Northwest and Alaska region respondents. Respondents from the Southwest and Hawaii rated the need for Status research on Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation higher than did Great Lakes region and Northern Midwest region respondents.

*Theoretical Studies*

Only one pairwise difference was found with regard to Theoretical research needs (see Table 18). Mid-Atlantic region respondents rated the need for Theoretical research on Nature of Facilities higher than did Northwest and Alaska respondents.

*Relational Studies*

Five pairwise differences were found relative to Relational research needs. Mid-Atlantic region respondents perceived a greater need than did Great Lakes region respondents for Relational research on Policy of Facility Usage, Facility Users, Management of Facilities, and Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships. Southwest and Hawaii respondents perceived the need for Relational research in the area of Nature of Interagency Relationships as greater than did Great Lakes respondents. In sum, it is safe to say that perceptions of research needs across these regions are not dramatically different.

*Rating of Research Needs by Degree Level of Respondents*

Since we felt that perceptions of research needs might be influenced by the respondent's level of academic training, each respondent was to indicate the highest degree held by checking whether it was the bachelor's, master's, doctorate, or "other."

One-way analyses of variance and Scheffé tests were used to determine differences in perceptions of research needs among persons holding different college degrees. The statistically

## Table 17

A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Status Research Needs Among Persons in Different Geographical Regions of the United States

| CONTENT AREA | TOTAL $\bar{x}$ | TOTAL SD | GEOGRAPHICAL REGION (1) New England $\bar{x}$ | (1) New England SD | (2) Mid-Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | (2) Mid-Atlantic SD | (3) South Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | (3) South Atlantic SD | (4) Southern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | (4) Southern Midwest SD | (5) Great Lakes $\bar{x}$ | (5) Great Lakes SD | (6) Northern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | (6) Northern Midwest SD | (7) Southwest & Hawaii $\bar{x}$ | (7) Southwest & Hawaii SD | (8) Northwest & Alaska $\bar{x}$ | (8) Northwest & Alaska SD | df | F | Scheffé results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Citizen Attitudes | 3.89 | 1.06 | 3.84 | 1.09 | 3.91 | 1.04 | 3.90 | 1.01 | 3.84 | 1.26 | 3.98 | 1.06 | 3.72 | 1.00 | 4.11 | .88 | 3.80 | 1.10 | 7,858 | 1.09ns | No Differences |
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.83 | 1.10 | 3.90 | 1.15 | 4.08 | .96 | 4.02 | .99 | 3.78 | 1.11 | 3.89 | 1.11 | 3.72 | 1.16 | 3.89 | 1.13 | 3.70 | 1.06 | 7,860 | 2.05* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.78 | 1.12 | 3.80 | 1.14 | 3.96 | 1.03 | 3.94 | 1.00 | 3.72 | 1.24 | 3.66 | 1.10 | 3.68 | 1.13 | 3.66 | 1.22 | 3.80 | 1.07 | 7,858 | 1.19ns | No Differences |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.68 | 1.04 | 3.78 | 1.06 | 3.86 | .95 | 3.76 | 1.07 | 3.52 | 1.07 | 3.64 | 1.09 | 3.61 | 1.02 | 4.01 | .91 | 3.53 | .98 | 7,855 | 2.83** | No Pairwise Differences |
| Use of Facilities | 3.67 | 1.09 | 3.59 | 1.07 | 4.04 | .97 | 3.81 | 1.07 | 3.81 | 1.11 | 3.61 | 1.13 | 3.67 | 1.15 | 3.58 | 1.06 | 3.49 | 1.10 | 7,858 | 2.33* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.65 | 1.03 | 3.72 | 1.07 | 3.81 | .93 | 3.67 | 1.00 | 3.55 | 1.05 | 3.60 | 1.05 | 3.67 | 1.04 | 3.81 | 1.03 | 3.63 | 1.02 | 7,851 | 1.45ns | No Differences |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 3.62 | 1.12 | 3.72 | 1.17 | 3.87 | .97 | 3.62 | 1.13 | 3.56 | 1.14 | 3.62 | 1.12 | 3.33 | 1.21 | 3.85 | 1.06 | 3.60 | 1.04 | 7,856 | 2.54* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 3.59 | 1.11 | 3.57 | 1.14 | 3.78 | 1.10 | 3.56 | 1.17 | 3.55 | 1.10 | 3.38 | 1.13 | 3.66 | 1.04 | 3.85 | 1.06 | 3.73 | 1.01 | 7,855 | 2.45* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 3.56 | 1.06 | 3.69 | 1.05 | 3.66 | .86 | 3.47 | 1.11 | 3.46 | 1.15 | 3.42 | 1.08 | 3.32 | 1.06 | 3.96 | .99 | 3.62 | 1.02 | 7,858 | 3.94*** | $\bar{x}_7 > \bar{x}_6, \bar{x}_8$ |
| Facility Cost | 3.54 | 1.25 | 3.68 | 1.18 | 3.89 | 1.11 | 3.58 | 1.22 | 3.44 | 1.33 | 3.40 | 1.31 | 3.67 | 1.31 | 3.46 | 1.24 | 3.13 | 1.11 | 7,860 | 2.94** | $\bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_8$ |
| Policy of Facility Usage | 3.53 | 1.12 | 3.55 | 1.12 | 3.79 | 1.09 | 3.69 | 1.06 | 3.40 | 1.05 | 3.32 | 1.15 | 3.66 | 1.22 | 3.64 | 1.04 | 3.53 | 1.00 | 7,855 | 2.54* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Cost of Interagency Relationships | 3.53 | 1.10 | 3.76 | 1.06 | 3.56 | 1.14 | 3.77 | 1.06 | 3.38 | 1.20 | 3.40 | 1.07 | 3.34 | 1.06 | 3.69 | 1.08 | 3.55 | 1.05 | 7,858 | 2.67** | No Pairwise Differences |
| Nature of Community Councils | 3.49 | 1.12 | 3.53 | 1.12 | 3.73 | .93 | 3.52 | 1.11 | 3.68 | 1.18 | 3.34 | 1.12 | 3.38 | 1.19 | 3.53 | 1.10 | 3.47 | 1.21 | 7,857 | 1.79ns | No Differences |
| Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 3.48 | 1.08 | 3.63 | 1.05 | 3.76 | 1.06 | 3.46 | 1.02 | 3.37 | 1.11 | 3.31 | 1.07 | 3.38 | 1.16 | 3.68 | 1.01 | 3.48 | 1.10 | 7,857 | 2.61* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Nature of Citizens in the Community | 3.46 | 1.16 | 3.48 | 1.20 | 3.55 | 1.05 | 3.44 | 1.17 | 3.55 | 1.30 | 3.47 | 1.14 | 3.21 | 1.11 | 3.67 | 1.10 | 3.25 | 1.16 | 7,849 | 1.42ns | No Differences |
| Management of Facilities | 3.38 | 1.09 | 3.49 | 1.12 | 3.70 | 1.03 | 3.60 | 1.05 | 3.28 | 1.03 | 3.25 | 1.11 | 3.27 | 1.15 | 3.23 | .97 | 3.28 | 1.09 | 7,857 | 2.83** | No Pairwise Differences |
| Facility Users | 3.35 | 1.10 | 3.37 | 1.18 | 3.59 | .95 | 3.53 | .97 | 3.34 | 1.11 | 3.25 | 1.15 | 3.30 | 1.15 | 3.34 | 1.04 | 3.08 | 1.03 | 7,858 | 1.78ns | No Differences |
| Nature of Facilities | 3.09 | 1.09 | 3.08 | 1.07 | 3.36 | 1.03 | 3.21 | 1.01 | 3.24 | 1.11 | 3.06 | 1.07 | 3.07 | 1.21 | 2.92 | 1.03 | 2.66 | 1.17 | 7,854 | 2.76** | $\bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_8$ |

ns: not significant
*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$
***: $p < .001$

## Table 18

A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Theoretical Research Needs Among Persons in Different Geographic Regions of the United States

| CONTENT AREA | TOTAL $\bar{x}$ | TOTAL SD | GEOGRAPHICAL REGION (1) New England $\bar{x}$ | (1) SD | (2) Mid-Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | (2) SD | (3) South Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | (3) SD | (4) Southern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | (4) SD | (5) Great Lakes $\bar{x}$ | (5) SD | (6) Northern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | (6) SD | (7) Southwest & Hawaii $\bar{x}$ | (7) SD | (8) Northwest & Alaska $\bar{x}$ | (8) SD | df | F | Scheffé results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.98 | 1.03 | 3.96 | 1.06 | 4.05 | .98 | 4.09 | 1.07 | 3.97 | 1.04 | 3.81 | 1.07 | 3.95 | .94 | 4.13 | .95 | 3.95 | .99 | 7,878 | 1.37ns | No Differences |
| Citizen Attitudes | 3.85 | 1.04 | 3.87 | 1.12 | 3.76 | 1.02 | 3.80 | 1.09 | 3.67 | 1.20 | 4.03 | .97 | 3.64 | .96 | 4.04 | .96 | 3.70 | 1.02 | 7,878 | 2.60* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.83 | 1.13 | 3.88 | 1.13 | 4.10 | .96 | 3.89 | 1.03 | 3.91 | 1.16 | 3.69 | 1.13 | 3.82 | 1.06 | 3.65 | 1.25 | 3.84 | 1.13 | 7,878 | 1.73ns | No Differences |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.82 | 1.02 | 3.91 | .95 | 3.88 | 1.00 | 3.91 | 1.09 | 3.73 | 1.03 | 3.67 | 1.09 | 3.80 | .94 | 4.07 | .98 | 3.84 | .95 | 7,878 | 1.74ns | No Differences |
| Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.68 | 1.04 | 3.73 | 1.01 | 3.73 | 1.06 | 3.64 | 1.08 | 3.62 | 1.16 | 3.63 | 1.07 | 3.57 | 1.00 | 3.86 | .91 | 3.74 | .93 | 7,878 | .69ns | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 3.64 | 1.07 | 3.69 | 1.06 | 3.70 | .95 | 3.70 | 1.12 | 3.56 | 1.08 | 3.62 | 1.10 | 3.56 | 1.04 | 3.89 | 1.05 | 3.72 | 1.10 | 7,877 | 1.34ns | No Differences |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 3.61 | 1.10 | 3.75 | 1.06 | 3.73 | 1.02 | 3.61 | 1.03 | 3.61 | 1.21 | 3.57 | 1.11 | 3.41 | 1.18 | 3.89 | 1.01 | 3.30 | 1.08 | 7,875 | 2.42* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 3.60 | 1.06 | 3.61 | 1.05 | 3.59 | 1.00 | 3.52 | 1.07 | 3.63 | 1.13 | 3.55 | 1.02 | 3.47 | .99 | 3.83 | 1.10 | 3.87 | 1.06 | 7,877 | 1.49ns | No Differences |
| Use of Facilities | 3.57 | 1.12 | 3.35 | 1.15 | 3.79 | 1.08 | 3.64 | 1.17 | 3.60 | 1.11 | 3.64 | 1.10 | 3.73 | 1.15 | 3.46 | 1.11 | 3.21 | 1.06 | 7,873 | 2.77** | No Pairwise Differences |
| Nature of Community Councils | 3.54 | 1.15 | 3.58 | 1.24 | 3.78 | .93 | 3.55 | 1.14 | 3.69 | 1.10 | 3.39 | 1.15 | 3.38 | 1.19 | 3.61 | 1.08 | 3.62 | 1.30 | 7,876 | 1.85ns | No Differences |
| Nature of Ciziens in Community | 3.47 | 1.17 | 3.47 | 1.26 | 3.52 | 1.07 | 3.66 | 1.06 | 3.52 | 1.26 | 3.51 | 1.15 | 3.13 | 1.17 | 3.60 | 1.08 | 3.34 | 1.18 | 7,868 | 1.88ns | No Differences |
| Policy of Facility Usage | 3.44 | 1.15 | 3.40 | 1.18 | 3.63 | 1.06 | 3.50 | 1.15 | 3.45 | 1.02 | 3.28 | 1.24 | 3.66 | 1.19 | 3.48 | 1.08 | 3.34 | 1.01 | 7,874 | 1.72ns | No Differences |
| Cost of Interagency Relationships | 3.41 | 1.11 | 3.40 | 1.20 | 3.40 | 1.14 | 3.55 | 1.12 | 3.34 | 1.09 | 3.39 | 1.06 | 3.35 | 1.07 | 3.56 | 1.04 | 3.36 | 1.16 | 7,872 | .48ns | No Differences |
| Type of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 3.36 | 1.13 | 3.30 | 1.17 | 3.67 | 1.01 | 3.34 | 1.15 | 3.30 | 1.19 | 3.33 | 1.15 | 3.37 | 1.06 | 3.41 | 1.08 | 3.18 | 1.16 | 7,874 | 1.38ns | No Differences |
| Facility Cost | 3.29 | 1.32 | 3.28 | 1.40 | 3.55 | 1.29 | 3.20 | 1.33 | 3.23 | 1.39 | 3.26 | 1.28 | 3.51 | 1.33 | 3.27 | 1.20 | 2.90 | 1.23 | 7,870 | 1.82ns | No Differences |
| Management of Facilities | 3.23 | 1.12 | 3.23 | 1.18 | 3.37 | 1.08 | 3.38 | 1.03 | 3.29 | 1.09 | 3.13 | 1.11 | 3.47 | 1.18 | 3.08 | 1.06 | 2.92 | 1.10 | 7,875 | 2.30* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Facility Users | 3.13 | 1.07 | 3.01 | 1.04 | 3.32 | .97 | 3.24 | 1.03 | 3.18 | 1.15 | 3.15 | 1.11 | 3.12 | 1.07 | 3.14 | 1.00 | 2.86 | 1.03 | 7,874 | 1.44ns | No Differences |
| Nature of Facilities | 2.94 | 1.07 | 2.80 | 1.07 | 3.21 | 1.04 | 3.00 | 1.01 | 2.99 | 1.16 | 3.02 | 1.09 | 2.93 | 1.12 | 2.79 | .92 | 2.54 | .91 | 7,868 | 2.94** | $\bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_8$ |

ns: not significant
*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$
***: $p < .001$







BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 19

A Summary of One-Way Analyses of Variance and Scheffé Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Relational Research Needs Among Persons in Different Geographical Regions of the United States

| CONTENT AREA | TOTAL $\bar{x}$ | TOTAL SD | GEOGRAPHICAL REGION (1) New England $\bar{x}$ | (1) SD | (2) Mid-Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | (2) SD | (3) South Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | (3) SD | (4) Southern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | (4) SD | (5) Great Lakes $\bar{x}$ | (5) SD | (6) Northern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | (6) SD | (7) Southwest & Hawaii $\bar{x}$ | (7) SD | (8) Northwest & Alaska $\bar{x}$ | (8) SD | df | F | Scheffé results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Citizen Attitudes | 3.99 | 1.00 | 3.91 | 1.03 | 3.91 | .96 | 3.94 | 1.00 | 4.01 | 1.09 | 4.04 | 1.02 | 3.88 | 1.02 | 4.14 | .95 | 4.15 | .86 | 7,850 | .93ns | No Differences |
| Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 3.89 | 1.02 | 3.99 | 1.04 | 4.08 | .84 | 4.07 | .95 | 3.84 | .96 | 3.69 | 1.11 | 3.78 | 1.01 | 4.08 | .95 | 3.83 | 1.00 | 7,854 | 2.93** | No Pairwise Differences |
| Nature of Interagency Relationships | 3.76 | .99 | 3.78 | .97 | 3.91 | .95 | 3.78 | .91 | 3.80 | 1.08 | 3.61 | 1.03 | 3.68 | .98 | 4.08 | .88 | 3.74 | .96 | 7,845 | 2.27* | $\bar{x}_7 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Training of Community Education Personnel | 3.72 | 1.14 | 3.68 | 1.15 | 3.89 | 1.10 | 3.84 | .97 | 3.63 | 1.24 | 3.63 | 1.19 | 3.66 | 1.14 | 3.74 | 1.15 | 3.89 | 1.02 | 7,851 | .93ns | No Differences |
| Nature of Citizens in Community | 3.69 | 1.10 | 3.65 | 1.09 | 3.69 | 1.05 | 3.70 | 1.06 | 3.79 | 1.15 | 3.62 | 1.12 | 3.57 | 1.14 | 3.98 | 1.07 | 3.72 | 1.11 | 7,846 | 1.03ns | No Differences |
| Funding of Citizen Participation | 3.64 | 1.13 | 3.70 | 1.13 | 3.61 | 1.08 | 3.52 | 1.14 | 3.78 | 1.17 | 3.66 | 1.15 | 3.47 | 1.17 | 3.81 | 1.08 | 3.52 | .99 | 7,847 | 1.04ns | No Differences |
| Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 3.63 | 1.07 | 3.60 | 1.09 | 3.79 | 1.10 | 3.79 | .92 | 3.55 | 1.07 | 3.56 | 1.07 | 3.49 | 1.11 | 3.81 | 1.09 | 3.60 | 1.04 | 7,848 | 1.31ns | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 3.62 | 1.12 | 3.57 | 1.20 | 3.72 | 1.07 | 3.67 | 1.18 | 3.52 | 1.14 | 3.53 | 1.17 | 3.60 | .98 | 3.89 | .88 | 3.69 | 1.08 | 7,852 | 1.10ns | No Differences |
| Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 3.61 | 1.09 | 3.63 | 1.16 | 3.55 | 1.05 | 3.57 | .98 | 3.66 | 1.14 | 3.58 | 1.15 | 3.40 | 1.00 | 3.89 | 1.00 | 3.80 | 1.07 | 7,852 | 1.57ns | No Differences |
| Use of Facilities | 3.58 | 1.10 | 3.54 | 1.10 | 3.92 | .82 | 3.72 | 1.10 | 3.37 | 1.10 | 3.52 | 1.17 | 3.57 | 1.11 | 3.59 | 1.08 | 3.44 | 1.08 | 7,846 | 2.20* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Cost of Interagency Relationships | 3.56 | 1.07 | 3.71 | 1.18 | 3.74 | .99 | 3.66 | 1.11 | 3.27 | 1.13 | 3.43 | 1.04 | 3.48 | .97 | 3.68 | 1.09 | 3.59 | .94 | 7,847 | 1.93ns | No Differences |
| Nature of Community Councils | 3.54 | 1.14 | 3.58 | 1.20 | 3.53 | 1.04 | 3.65 | 1.11 | 3.63 | 1.24 | 3.42 | 1.16 | 3.36 | 1.13 | 3.85 | .97 | 3.61 | 1.07 | 7,843 | 1.72ns | No Differences |
| Type of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 3.51 | 1.06 | 3.54 | 1.15 | 3.80 | .87 | 3.50 | 1.01 | 3.58 | 1.05 | 3.35 | 1.10 | 3.44 | 1.05 | 3.65 | .97 | 3.51 | 1.10 | 7,852 | 2.16* | $\bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Policy of Facility Usage | 3.49 | 1.13 | 3.56 | 1.08 | 3.82 | .93 | 3.60 | 1.11 | 3.33 | 1.07 | 3.32 | 1.27 | 3.50 | 1.14 | 3.61 | .94 | 3.35 | 1.08 | 7,848 | 2.61* | $\bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Facility Cost | 3.41 | 1.26 | 3.35 | 1.35 | 3.85 | 1.09 | 3.39 | 1.28 | 3.30 | 1.22 | 3.28 | 1.29 | 3.45 | 1.25 | 3.53 | 1.20 | 3.28 | 1.16 | 7,845 | 2.36* | No Pairwise Differences |
| Facility Users | 3.40 | 1.11 | 3.32 | 1.17 | 3.67 | .87 | 3.54 | 1.04 | 3.53 | 1.14 | 3.19 | 1.20 | 3.43 | 1.04 | 3.57 | 1.03 | 3.35 | 1.10 | 7,848 | 2.70** | $\bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Management of Facilities | 3.35 | 1.07 | 3.33 | 1.10 | 3.76 | .93 | 3.46 | .97 | 3.36 | 1.08 | 3.13 | 1.13 | 3.31 | 1.05 | 3.42 | 1.06 | 3.35 | .95 | 7,846 | 3.65*** | $\bar{x}_2 > \bar{x}_5$ |
| Nature of Facilities | 3.12 | 1.07 | 3.03 | 1.12 | 3.51 | .93 | 3.30 | 1.05 | 3.23 | 1.00 | 2.96 | 1.08 | 3.18 | 1.15 | 3.03 | .99 | 2.96 | 1.06 | 7,847 | 3.36** | No Pairwise Differences |

ns: not significant
*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$
***: $p < .001$





BEST COPY AVAILABLE

significant ($p < .05$) results from these analyses are summarized in Table 20. There were 6 statistically significant omnibus F's detected for Status research, while 4 were found for Theoretical research, and 5 for Relational research.

For the six significant Status research needs, five included statistically significant (Scheffé) pairwise differences. Persons with doctoral degrees thought Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships was more important as a research need than did individuals with bachelor's degrees. Persons holding "other" degrees felt Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships to be a more demanding need than did people with bachelor's or master's degrees. Those holding the bachelor's and master's degrees believed Facility Users to be a more pressing Status research need than did those persons holding the doctorate, but doctorate holders felt Status research on Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation to be more needed than did those with bachelor's and master's degrees. Finally, "other" degree holders perceived a higher need than did those with the doctorate degree for Status research on Management of Facilities.

When assessing needs for Theoretical research, those persons with bachelor's degrees felt Nature of Community Councils to be more important than did persons with master's degrees. Respondents with the master's degree perceived a greater need for Theoretical research on Nature of Facilities than did those with doctorates. Holders of doctorate degrees felt that Theoretical research on Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation was more needed than did holders of either master's or "other" degrees. Lastly, for Theoretical research needs, holders of "other" degrees felt Management of Facilities to be a greater research need than did holders of doctorates.

When considering needs for Relational research, master's, doctorate, and "other" degree holders assessed the need for research on Evaluation of Interagency Relationships to be higher than did those holding the bachelor's degree. Relational research on Facility Users was deemed more important by those with the bachelor's than by those with the master's or doctorate. However, those holding the doctorate felt Relational research on Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation to be more needed than did those individuals with either bachelor's or master's degrees. The final statistically significant pairwise difference for Relational research indicated that those with doctorates felt Cost of Interagency Relationships more important than did holders of master's or bachelor's degrees.

*Rating of Research Needs by Type of Formal Training*

The final comparison made was between the research needs assessments of persons who differed in whether their formal community education training was academic degree related, through in-service work, through short-term workshops, or "other". Only 2 of the 54 analyses of variance yielded statistically significant ($p < .05$) omnibus F tests. These two significant cases are summarized in Table 2 I. Persons who had differing types of formal training in community

## Table 20

A Summary of Significant One-Way Analysis of Variance and Scheffe Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Research Needs Among Persons Holding Different Academic Degrees

HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE HELD

| Need No. | Total $\bar{X}$ | Total SD | 1 Bachelor's $\bar{X}$ | 1 Bachelor's SD | 2 Master's $\bar{X}$ | 2 Master's SD | 3 Doctorate $\bar{X}$ | 3 Doctorate SD | 4 Other $\bar{X}$ | 4 Other SD | F | df | Scheffé results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | 3.83 | 1.10 | 3.66 | 1.11 | 3.81 | 1.09 | 4.00 | 1.08 | 3.96 | 1.11 | 2.84* | 3,858 | $\bar{X}_3 > \bar{X}_1$ |
| 10. | 3.58 | 1.11 | 3.39 | 1.14 | 3.55 | 1.09 | 3.70 | 1.13 | 3.94 | 1.04 | 4.69** | 3,853 | $\bar{X}_4 > \bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2$ |
| 14. | 3.57 | 1.06 | 3.48 | .96 | 3.49 | 1.07 | 3.83 | 1.05 | 3.62 | 1.09 | 4.90** | 3,856 | $\bar{X}_3 > \bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2$ |
| 2. | 3.49 | 1.12 | 3.71 | 1.08 | 3.41 | 1.12 | 3.60 | 1.12 | 3.40 | 1.21 | 3.40* | 3,855 | No Pairwise Differences |
| 15. | 3.39 | 1.09 | 3.48 | 1.05 | 3.40 | 1.10 | 3.17 | 1.10 | 3.62 | .93 | 3.67* | 3,855 | $\bar{X}_4 > \bar{X}_3$ |
| 13. | 3.35 | 1.10 | 3.51 | 1.05 | 3.39 | 1.07 | 3.13 | 1.13 | 3.31 | 1.20 | 3.59* | 3,856 | $\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2 > \bar{X}_3$ |
| Theoretical | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. | 3.61 | 1.05 | 3.66 | 1.03 | 3.53 | 1.07 | 3.84 | .91 | 3.47 | 1.11 | 4.47** | 3,875 | $\bar{X}_3 > \bar{X}_4, \bar{X}_2$ |
| 2. | 3.54 | 1.15 | 3.76 | 1.07 | 3.45 | 1.14 | 3.65 | 1.19 | 3.47 | 1.20 | 3.32* | 3,873 | $\bar{X}_1 > \bar{X}_2$ |
| 15. | 3.24 | 1.12 | 3.24 | 1.09 | 3.26 | 1.11 | 3.03 | 1.14 | 3.54 | 1.11 | 3.85** | 3,873 | $\bar{X}_4 > \bar{X}_3$ |
| 9. | 2.95 | 1.06 | 2.87 | 1.07 | 3.02 | 1.02 | 2.77 | 1.13 | 2.99 | 1.15 | 2.79* | 3,866 | $\bar{X}_2 > \bar{X}_3$ |
| Relational | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | 3.63 | 1.07 | 3.31 | 1.04 | 3.70 | 1.04 | 3.65 | 1.15 | 3.72 | 1.06 | 4.81** | 3,846 | $\bar{X}_4, \bar{X}_2, \bar{X}_3 > \bar{X}_1$ |
| 14. | 3.61 | 1.09 | 3.50 | .95 | 3.54 | 1.13 | 3.83 | 1.07 | 3.75 | 1.08 | 3.77* | 3,850 | $\bar{X}_3 > \bar{X}_2, \bar{X}_1$ |
| 16. | 3.57 | 1.07 | 3.38 | .98 | 3.52 | 1.07 | 3.81 | 1.08 | 3.68 | 1.09 | 4.84** | 3,845 | $\bar{X}_3 > \bar{X}_2, \bar{X}_1$ |
| 13. | 3.41 | 1.11 | 3.66 | 1.03 | 3.37 | 1.09 | 3.25 | 1.13 | 3.54 | 1.27 | 3.89** | 3,846 | $\bar{X}_1 > \bar{X}_2, \bar{X}_3$ |
| 15. | 3.35 | 1.07 | 3.32 | .94 | 3.41 | 1.05 | 3.14 | 1.14 | 3.47 | 1.19 | 3.12* | 3,844 | No Pairwise Differences |

*Needs*

1. Facility Cost
2. Nature of Community Councils
3. Use of Facilities
4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships
5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships
6. Nature of Citizens in the Community
7. Nature of Interagency Relationships
8. Citizen Attitudes
9. Nature of Facilities
10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships
11. Policy of Facility Usage
12. Funding of Citizen Participation
13. Facility Users
14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation
15. Management of Facilities
16. Cost of Interagency Relationships
17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships
18. Training of Community Education Personnel

*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$
***: $p < .001$





BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 21

A Summary of Significant One-Way Analysis of Variance and Scheffe Tests to Determine Differences in Perceptions of Research Needs Among Persons with Different Kinds of Formal Training

| | FORMAL TRAINING | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | 1 Academic Degree Related | | 2 Through In-service Work | | 3 Short term Workshops | | 4 Other | | | |
| Need No. | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | F | df | Scheffé results |
| Status (16.) | 3.53 | 1.10 | 3.66 | 1.06 | 3.39 | 1.14 | 3.50 | 1.00 | 3.31 | 1.15 | 4.79** | 3,856 | No Pairwise Differences |
| Theoretical (16.) | 3.42 | 1.11 | 3.51 | 1.06 | 3.27 | 1.15 | 3.43 | 1.16 | 3.37 | 1.11 | 2.94* | 3,870 | $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_2$ |
| Relational (None) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*Need*

16. Cost of Interagency Relationships

*: $p < .05$
**: $p < .01$

education did not assess any of the Relational research needs differently. Although the omnibus F test for the need for Status research on the Cost of Interagency Relationships was statistically significant, no pairwise difference (Scheffé tests) was found. The only pairwise difference that occurred was for the need for Theoretical research on the Cost of Interagency Relationships. Respondents whose formal training in community education was academic degree related perceived a greater need for this kind of research than did respondents whose formal training was through in-service work.

## CHAPTER 5

### Summary

This study was conducted by the Bureau of Educational Research, University of Virginia for the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education. Recognizing the need for research in Community Education, the Mid-Atlantic Education Consortium has entered into a series of efforts aimed at identifying research needs and, ultimately, at developing systematic funded research efforts. A five year plan (1978-1983) was developed to accomplish this task. This plan included the awarding of mini-grants ($500-$1500) for specific research projects. Toward this aim, the Mid-Atlantic Consortium established the Research and Evaluation Board to assist in the development of criteria for identifying the types of research to be undertaken. At the July, 1978, meeting of the Board, eight community education goals were identified. It was determined that it was not necessary to pursue research on all eight goals at the same time or with the same intensity. Since three of the goals were somewhat difficult to define and might require different sorts of investigation, they were to be handled differently from the remaining five goals which could easily be operationalized. Three common themes encompassed these five goals: Facility Use, Interagency Cooperation, and Citizen Participation. In order to promote a more organized research effort, it was necessary to assess the existing state of research in these three areas. Since no comprehensive review of the research in these areas was available, a contract was entered into with Nancy Cook to produce reviews of the areas.

The three Cook reports provided comprehensive reviews of research in the areas of Citizen Participation, Facility Use, and Interagency Relationships. In addition, the reports indicated 155 potential research questions and needs. The Board atempted to review the reports and their research questions in hopes of choosing a few target areas for research; however, this task proved exceptionally difficult.

At this point the Board directed Michael Kaplan to fund a research study which would identify community education research needs. The premise of this decision was that practicing community educat ors' perceptions of research needs would provide essential (but not the only) input for making final decisions about target research areas. An agreement was made with Bruce Gansneder and the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Virginia to conduct this project from October 1, 1979, to June 31, 1980

The following parameters were established for the project:

(1) The focus would continue to be on Citizen Participation, Facility Use, and Interagency Relationships

(2) The research questions identified in the three Cook reports would provide the starting point for the development of an appropriate conceptual framework for the study

(3) Practicing community educators would compose the target respondent population

(4) Perceptions of research needs would be determined and prioritized

(5) Discrepancies in the perceptions of community educators according to selected characteristics would be determined.

The last two parameters suggest the two general research questions of this stydy: (I) what are the research needs in community education as perceived by community educators, and (2) are research needs perceived differently by community educators who differ according to selected characteristics? These two general questions were later translated into a number of more specific questions, including the following:

(1) How do community educators assess the need for selected types of research?

(2) Do community educators from different regions of the country assess research needs differently?

(3) Do community educators with differing responsibilities (i.e., university, state, school, division, school building, other) assess research needs differently?

The first phase of this study involved a review of the Cook reports and the development of a conceptual framework for this study. Cook(I979a, I979b, and, I979c) identified I55 questions: 28 in the area of Facility Use, 57 in the area of Interagency Relationships, and 70 in the area of Citizen Participation (see Appendix A). The Research Board had initially hoped that they would be able to take whatever questions had been generated, appoint several working teams review the questions, select several of the "most important" questions, and then fund researchers—through mini-grants—to conduct the research. A casual glance at the I55 questions provided in Appendix A is all that is needed to recognize the the Board was faced with an enormous task. (It should be pointed out the Cook's task was *not* to provide a comprehensive conceptually based list of questions nor was it to prioritize the questions. Her task was to review the literature and identify potential research questions from the available literature, her own insight, and that of the team.)

How does one go about the task of selecting the most important questions? A rank ordering of the I55 questions is not feasible due both to the sheer number of questions and to the problems inherent in the list. Some small number (say 10), might be selected, but this is impossible without specific criteria to guide the selection. Certainly, criteria of "importance" could be developed which might include value judgments about the importance of the research results to community education, decisions about the immediacy of payoff from the research results, assessment of the feasibility of the research (can it actually be done?), estimates of the cost of the research, and

estimates of the length of time it would take to complete the research. Additional crtiteria could be developed from any beginning research text (e.g., Selltiz, et. al). It was apparent to the Research Board, however, that there was an overriding problem in the list of questions: there was no unifying structure that could be used to classify and group the questions. The existence of a unifying structure or conceptual framework would certainly make the task both more manageable and more meaningful.

As a first attempt at organizing the questions, three subareas--finance, role definition and image, and policy and position--were postulated to cut across all three major areas.

However, when an attempt was made to classify the questions according to this scheme, it was found that not all questions fit reasonably into one of the nine postulated subareas. Recognizing the need for the development of a conceptual framework and for input from professional community educators in the field, the Board suggested that a contract should be made with some outside agency to complete the task.

It was at this point that the authors of this report entered the picture. Discussions were held between Michael Caldwell and Bruce Gansneder of the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Virginia and Michael Kaplan and a decision was made to attempt the following:

(1) develop a conceptual framework for the research questions

(2) develop a survey instrument which could be sent to professional community educators in the field

(3) conduct this survey and report its results.

After a review of the Cook reports and the research questions that had been identified, a preliminary attempt at a content-analytic sorting of the questions was made. Several problems emerged, some of which resulted from the fact that the questions had no unifying structure or underlying conceptual framework.

As a result, a new approach was tried in which an attempt was made first to consolidate questions both by rewriting some questions more broadly so that they encompassed several extremely detailed questions, and by deleting others which were repetitious. In addition, several questions were added to eliminate gaps in coverage of all three major areas. The resulting set of questions was examined and approved at a meeting involving project personnel from the Bureau of Educational Research and the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education. At this meeting, it was also determined that these questions would best be used to generate a smaller number of research subareas independently within each of the three major areas rather than across all three areas. This was necessary in order to eventually produce a survey with a more reasonable number of items at a level of specificity which would be most useful for producing RFP's. It was felt that survey items as specific as many of the questions would generate RFP's so specific as to limit researchers.

Subareas generated for each of the major areas are shown in Figure 10.

All of the research questions fit reasonably well into these categories. Certain questions were found to be repetitious and were deleted. Certain categories were found to include fewer questions, and in some cases questions were added. A second underlying dimension now became apparent. This dimension was called "type of research." Questions fell into three types. The first type was Status research, which would involve empirical data collection to answer questions about current status. For this type of research no attempt would be made to test hypotheses, only to describe. The second type of research, Theoretical, would be non-empirical. It would involve the development of theoretical or conceptual frameworks that might later be used to conduct empirical research. The third type of research, Relational, would be empirical research to test hypotheses about relationships among variables in community education. This conceptualization resulted in an 18 by 3 (content area by type of research) matrix, as shown in Figure 11.

This framework served as the basis for development of the survey instrument. Ten additional questions were asked to determine various characteristics of the respondents. Questions were also added to determine the content area perceived as having the greatest need for research and the content area having the second greatest need for research under each of the three research types.

No single nationwide listing of community educators was readily available. Accordingly, the sampling procedure began with the mailing list of members of the National Community Education Association (NCEA). The list included a total of 2,045 persons, but a large portion of the list represented people who were not current full-time community educators. Some were retired or no longer in the field of community education; others were only peripherally involved in the field. In an attempt to narrow the list to only those members currently involved in full-time community education work, phone calls were made to the director of at least one state center for community education development in each state. Each director was asked to identify those people on the mailing list for that state who did not belong to the target population. This resulted in a target population of 1,371 full-time community educators who were current members of the National Community Education Association. To this list was added 25 names of state center directors who were not already on the list, resulting in a final target population of 1,396. As this was a very manageable number, project staff from the Bureau and the Mid-Atlantic Center made the decision to survey the entire population. Thus, 1,396 surveys with cover letters and return envelopes were sent out in mid-February, 1980. A follow-up reminder was then sent to each target respondent at the end of the month. Due to the bulk rate mail process used, many of the original surveys were not received by the target respondents until mid-March. The first mailing and follow-up reminder resulted in a return rate of approximately 50% (700 returned). When the return rate dropped toward the end of March, a second survey was sent to all nonrespondents. This resulted in the return of approximately 235 (17%) additional surveys—

| Research Area | Facility Use | Interagency Relationships | Citizen Participation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Subareas | Policy<br>Cost<br>Nature<br>Use<br>Users<br>Mananagement | Barriers/Facilitators<br>Evaluation of inter-agency relationships<br>Nature<br>Administrative issues<br>Cost<br>Type of agencies involved | Nature of community<br>Nature of citizens in the community<br>Citizen attitudes<br>Funding<br>Administrative issues<br>Training of personnel |

Figure 10. Subareas generated for each research area.

| Content Area | Type of Research | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Status | Theoretical | Relational |
| 1. Facility Cost | | | |
| 2. Nature of Community Councils | | | |
| 3. Use of Facilities | | | |
| 4 Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | | | |
| 5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | | | |
| 6. Nature of Citizens in the Community | | | |
| 7. Nature of Interagency Relationships | | | |
| 8. Citizen Attitudes | | | |
| 9. Nature of Facilities | | | |
| 10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | | | |
| 11. Policy of Facility Usage | | | |
| 12. Funding of Citizen Participation | | | |
| 13. Facility Users | | | |
| 14. Administrative Issue in Citizen Participation | | | |
| 15. Management of Facilities | | | |
| 16. Cost of Interagency Relationships | | | |
| 17. Types of agencies in Interagency Relationships | | | |
| 18. Training of community education personnel | | | |

Figure 11. Framework for development of the survey instrument.

for a total of 911 returned. Fifteen respondents were removed from the list after their returned surveys indicated that they were either unavailable or not really members of the target population. Some of these fifteen surveys were returned as undeliverable; others were returned with notes indicating that respondents had retired, changed fields, or were only peripherally involved in community education at the present. Thus, the number of potential respondents was reduced to 1,381. After the preliminary cutoff date was reached in mid-April and initial analyses were begun, approximately 25 (2%) additional surveys were received. These are not included in the present analysis but will be included in later analyses.

Sixty-six percent (911 of 1,381) of the surveys were returned. The rate was similar across the different geographic regions of the country. Six of the seven regions had a return rate between 65.6% and 70.5%. The return rate from the eighth region was 57.9%. The average age of the respondents was 39.4 years, with an average of 7.2 years as a professional in community education, and an average of 5.3 years in their present position. Of the 911 respondents, 437 worked at the system level, 179 at the building level, 91 at a university community education center, 68 at the state level, and 128 in "other" capacities (e.g., community recreation director, adult education director, etc.). More than half of the respondents had master's degrees (55.1%), had academic degree training in community education (51%), had previously been involved in a community education research project (61%), and indicated an interest in participating in community education research projects (80%).

Assessments of research needs by all respondents, as a total group, were analyzed first. Respondent assessments of the content areas most needing research (top four) and least needing research (bottom four) for each of the types of research are summarized in Table 22. As can be seen, the total groups perceives a need for all three types of research on Citizen Attitudes, Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, and Training of Community Education Personnel. In addition, a need is perceived for both Status research and Theoretical research on Evaluation of Interagency Relationships, and for Relational research on the Nature of Interagency Relationships. The areas perceived as having the least need for research, of all three types, are Nature of Facilities, Facility Users, and Management of Facilities. There is also little need seen for Theoretical and Relational research on Facility Costs, and for Status research on Nature of the Citizens in the Community.

Analyses were also conducted to determine whether perceptions of research needs differed by responsibility level or geographic location of the respondent. Although a number of specific differences in ratings of research needs were found among respondents having different levels of responsibility, there was a great deal of consistency across different types of respondents. The areas rated most in need (top 4) of research and least in need (bottom 4) of research for each type of research are presented in Table 23 by responsibility level.

First, let us consider Theoretical research needs. Only the content areas having the highest

research need ratings are summarized here. Building level, system level, and "other" respondents rate the same four content areas highest in need for Theoretical research: Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, Citizen Attitudes, Training of Community Education Personnel, and Evaluation of Interagency Relationships. The state and university respondents also rated Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships and Evaluation of Interagency Relationships in their top four and the university respondents included Training of Community Education Personnel. Two of the state respondents' top four research need areas were not in the top four of any other group. These were Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships and Nature of Interagency Relationships. The university respondents have one content area rated in their top four that was not in the top four of any other group--Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation.

In terms of Status research all five groups have Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships included among their top four research need areas. All groups of respondents except those at the state level also include Training of Community Education Personnel among their top four need areas. University and state respondents also had Evaluation of Interagency Relationships, while state and system respondents had Use of Facilities, and building and system respondents had Citizen Attitudes among their top four. Other needs are each rated high by only one of the five groups. Building level respondents include Nature of Citizens in the Community and Funding of Citizen Participation, state respondents include Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships, university respondents include Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation, and "other" respondents include Nature of Interagency Relationships.

In terms of Relational research, Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships is rated among the top four research needs by all five groups. Each group, except the state respondents also have Citizen Attitudes in their top four Relational research need areas while each group, except system respondents include Nature of Interagency Relationships among the top four Relational research needs. Training of Community Education Personnel is included among the top four needs by university and "other" respondents while Nature of Citizens in the Community is included by building level and system level respondents. System level respondents are the only group to include Use of Facilities, while state level respondents are the only group to include Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships and Evaluation of Interagency Relationships in the top four ratings.

The third major set of analyses focused on potential differences in the assessment of research needs across different geographic regions of the country. Only a few, isolated differences were found. The highest and lowest ratings by respondents from eight different regions are summarized in Table 24. Respondents from all eight regions had Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships and Evaluation of Interagency Relationships in their top four ratings for Theoretical research needs while respondents from seven of the eight regions also included Training of

## Table 24

Top and Bottom Four Rated Research Need Areas for Each Type of Research by Geographic Region

| Type of Research | Total Need No. | Total $\bar{x}$ | 1 New England Need No. | 1 New England $\bar{x}$ | 2 Mid Atlantic Need No. | 2 Mid Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | 3 South Atlantic Need No. | 3 South Atlantic $\bar{x}$ | 4 Southern Midwest Need No. | 4 Southern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | 5 Great Lakes Need No. | 5 Great Lakes $\bar{x}$ | 6 Northern Midwest Need No. | 6 Northern Midwest $\bar{x}$ | 7 Southwest & Hawaii Need No. | 7 Southwest & Hawaii $\bar{x}$ | 8 Northwest & Alaska Need No. | 8 Northwest & Alaska $\bar{x}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Status** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 4 | 8 | 3.89 | 4 | 3.90 | 4 | 4.08 | 4 | 4.02 | 8 | 3.84 | 8 | 3.96 | 4 & 8 | 3.72 | 8 | 4.11 | 14 | 3.82 |
| | 4 | 3.83 | 8 | 3.84 | 3 | 4.04 | 18 | 3.94 | 4 | 3.78 | 4 | 3.69 | 18 | 3.68 | 5 | 4.01 | 8 & 18 | 3.80 |
| | 18 | 3.76 | 18 | 3.80 | 18 | 3.96 | 8 | 3.90 | 18 | 3.72 | 18 | 3.66 | 1 & 3 | 3.67 | 14 | 3.96 | 10 | 3.73 |
| | 5 | 3.68 | 5 | 3.78 | 8 | 3.91 | 3 | 3.81 | 2 | 3.68 | 3 | 3.61 | | | 4 | 3.89 | | |
| Bottom 4 | 9 | 3.09 | 9 | 3.08 | 9 | 3.35 | 9 | 3.21 | 9 | 3.24 | 9 | 3.06 | 9 | 3.07 | 9 | 2.92 | 9 | 2.66 |
| | 13 | 3.35 | 13 | 3.37 | 6 | 3.55 | 6 | 3.44 | 15 | 3.28 | 13 & 15 | 3.25 | 6 | 3.21 | 15 | 3.23 | 13 | 3.08 |
| | 15 | 3.38 | 6 | 3.48 | 16 | 3.56 | 17 | 3.46 | 13 | 3.34 | 17 | 3.31 | 15 | 3.27 | 13 | 3.34 | 1 | 3.13 |
| | 6 | 3.46 | 15 | 3.49 | 13 | 3.59 | 14 | 3.47 | 17 | 3.37 | | | 13 | 3.30 | 1 | 3.46 | 6 | 3.25 |
| **Theoretical** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 4 | 4 | 3.96 | 4 | 3.96 | 18 | 4.10 | 4 | 4.09 | 4 | 3.97 | 8 | 4.03 | 4 | 3.95 | 4 | 4.13 | 4 | 3.95 |
| | 8 | 3.85 | 5 | 3.91 | 4 | 4.05 | 5 | 3.91 | 18 | 3.91 | 4 | 3.81 | 18 | 3.82 | 5 | 4.07 | 14 | 3.87 |
| | 18 | 3.83 | 18 | 3.88 | 5 | 3.88 | 18 | 3.89 | 5 | 3.73 | 18 | 3.69 | 5 | 3.80 | 8 | 4.04 | 5 & 18 | 3.84 |
| | 5 | 3.82 | 8 | 3.87 | 3 | 3.79 | 8 | 3.80 | 2 | 3.69 | 5 | 3.67 | 3 | 3.73 | 10 & 12 | 3.89 | | |
| Bottom 4 | 9 | 2.94 | 9 | 2.80 | 9 | 3.21 | 9 | 3.00 | 9 | 2.99 | 9 | 3.02 | 9 | 2.93 | 9 | 2.79 | 9 | 2.54 |
| | 13 | 3.13 | 13 | 3.01 | 13 | 3.32 | 1 | 3.20 | 13 | 3.18 | 15 | 3.13 | 13 | 3.12 | 15 | 3.08 | 13 | 2.85 |
| | 15 | 3.23 | 15 | 3.23 | 15 | 3.37 | 13 | 3.24 | 1 | 3.23 | 13 | 3.15 | 6 | 3.13 | 13 | 3.14 | 1 | 2.90 |
| | 1 | 3.29 | 1 | 3.28 | 16 | 3.40 | 17 | 3.34 | 15 | 3.29 | 1 | 3.26 | 16 | 3.35 | 1 | 3.27 | 15 | 2.92 |
| **Relational** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Top 4 | 8 | 3.99 | 4 | 3.99 | 4 | 4.04 | 4 | 4.07 | 8 | 4.01 | 8 | 4.04 | 8 | 3.88 | 8 | 4.14 | 8 | 4.15 |
| | 4 | 3.89 | 8 | 3.91 | 3 | 3.92 | 8 | 3.94 | 4 | 3.84 | 4 | 3.69 | 4 | 3.78 | 4 & 7 | 4.08 | 18 | 3.89 |
| | 7 | 3.76 | 7 | 3.78 | 7 & 8 | 3.91 | 18 | 3.84 | 7 | 3.80 | 12 | 3.66 | 7 | 3.68 | 6 | 3.96 | 4 | 3.83 |
| | 18 | 3.72 | 16 | 3.71 | | | 5 | 3.79 | 6 | 3.79 | 18 | 3.63 | 18 | 3.66 | | | 14 | 3.80 |
| Bottom 4 | 9 | 3.12 | 9 | 3.03 | 9 | 3.51 | 9 | 3.30 | 9 | 2.23 | 9 | 2.96 | 9 | 3.18 | 9 | 3.03 | 9 | 2.96 |
| | 15 | 3.35 | 13 | 3.32 | 2 | 3.53 | 1 | 3.39 | 1 | 3.30 | 15 | 3.13 | 15 | 3.31 | 15 | 3.42 | 1 | 3.28 |
| | 13 | 3.40 | 15 | 3.33 | 14 | 3.55 | 15 | 3.46 | 11 | 3.33 | 13 | 3.19 | 2 | 3.36 | 1 | 3.53 | 11,13 & 15 | 3.35 |
| | 1 | 3.41 | 1 | 3.35 | 12 | 3.61 | 17 | 3.50 | 15 | 3.36 | 1 | 3.28 | 14 | 3.40 | 13 | 3.57 | | |

1. Facility Cost
2. Nature of Community Council
3. Use of Facilities
4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships
5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships
6. Nature of Citizens in the Community
7. Nature of Interagency Relationships
8. Citizen Attitudes
9. Nature of Facilities
10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships
11. Policy of Facility Usage
12. Funding of Citizen Participation
13. Facility Users
14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation
15. Management of Facilities
16. Cost of Interagency Relationships
17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships
18. Training of Community Education Personnel



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Community Education Personnel, and respondents from four of the eight regions included Citizen Attitudes. A similar pattern is found for Status and Relational research needs. The high priority areas are, again, Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships, Citizen Attitudes, and Training of Community Education Personnel.

The third and fourth sets of analyses focused on potential differences in the assessment of research needs by respondents holding different academic degrees and having different types of formal training in community education. Again, only isolated differences were found in these analyses.

## CHAPTER 6

### Conclusions and Recommendations

Community educators in the field exhibit a strong interest in research. This is evidenced, first, by the response rate achieved on the survey. A 66% return rate (actually 69% since additional instruments were received after the deadline for starting analyses) is very good for a national mail survey and indicates that community educators want their views about the kinds of research needed to be known. In addition, they want to participate in research (80% indicated this). Community educators express an amazing amount of agreement about the kinds of research needed, particularly about the kinds of research most needed and least needed. The reader is reminded that the analytical techniques employed increased the probability of uncovering any possible differences, even at the risk of identifying some which may not exist. Although isolated differences were found between groups relative to the absolute ratings of the most needed and least needed kinds of research, these differences generally resulted from one group rating the most needed research even higher or the least needed research even lower. In addition, when needs were grouped into the four "most needed" and four "least needed" across the three "kinds" of research there was general agreement across groups. The only major exceptions appear to be logical. State personnel are less interested in Training of Community Education Personnel and are more interested in the Evaluation of Interagency Relationships. Building level and system level respondents, on the other hand, express a higher interest than other groups in Relational research on Nature of Citizens in the Community. This may suggest a desire for research on questions such as the following: what kinds of programs will be best attended by different kinds of citizens? what kinds of programs will be most effective with different kinds of citizens?

The positive response by community educators in the field and their degree of agreement seem to be in conflict with the apparent dearth of research in community education. One possibility is that community educators want research done but want someone else to do it. While they did tell us in this survey that they want to be involved in research, it may be that they want to be involved as participants or respondents but not as researchers. If this is true, it could be the result of a number of factors. Community educators may just be too busy to carry out research projects. It may also be that community educators do not have the knowledge required to conduct research. As mentioned in the beginning of this report, a number of efforts have been made to increase knowledge levels. These have included development of procedures and models for evaluation, the development of conceptual models for community education, and a very few attempts at the development of specific instruments. If any criticism may be made of

these efforts it would be that they lack specificity. Although we do not advocate "how to do it" approaches because they tend to be adopted mindlessly, we do recognize that practitioners need to begin research by "getting their feet wet." A four pronged attack is suggested. These four suggestions are specified further in the recommendations below. First, specific questions for study need to be identified. Second, operational definitions of "variables" in community education need to be developed. Third, small, well-conceived studies should be encouraged and supported. Since, too often, there is a tendency to attempt grandiose studies that are poorly defined. Biting off more than one can chew may result in choking to death or, at least, in future avoidance of the food. Fourth, training in research should be provided with the intent to increase research understanding. The intent should not be to produce research expertise. There are better approaches for achievement of the latter.

We did not find that the respondents leaned toward one type (i.e., Status, Theoretical or Relational) of research more than toward another. Yet, we advocate a greater leaning toward what we have termed Relational research. We feel that the most important questions have to do with what is effective in community education, with whom it is effective, under what conditions it is effective, and in what ways it is effective. Our own reviews of current research corroborate those of Cook. The few pieces of research available tend to be descriptive and non-explanatory. We recognize that this piece of research is also descriptive and non-explanatory, but we feel that it will help to set the stage for more explanatory research. At a minimum, within the areas of Citizen participation, Facility Usage, and Interagency Relationships, we hope that our findings will restrict the parameters of future research. Our study also raises some new questions. Research on Citizen Attitudes, for example, is highly valued by practitioners. What does this mean? What kinds of attitudes are of interest? How does one measure these attitudes? Are attitudes of interest in and of themselves, or are they of interest either because they can be changed by community educators or because these attitudes can influence the success of community education programs?

Finally, we recognize that the present research does not focus on all the content areas or goal areas possible. Any piece of research must set its parameters. Our parameters were set by the focus of the Mid-Atlantic Consortium. Surely, there are other areas in community education in which research is needed. We cannot specify these needs. We can only suggest that other researchers attend to them

*Specific Recommendations*

1. The Mid-Atlantic Center should continue its planned program of research by building on this work and that of Cook. Recommendations 2 to 3 speak specifically to this issue.

2. Primary research efforts should focus on six areas:

a. STATUS RESEARCH ON CITIZEN ATTITUDES

This research would focus on the kinds of questions given below. This list, of course, represents only examples and is not intended to be complete.

1. How do citizens feel about community education? Do different kinds (e.g., youths vs. adults) of citizens view community education differently?

2. Do citizens feel responsible for their community?

3.. Do citizens want to be involved in community decision making, community development, etc.?

4. Do community residents view community education as a community participation process?

5. Are community attitudes homogeneous? If not, does this mean that it is not reasonable to speak of community attitudes but only of attitudes of subgroups within the community?

b. RELATIONAL RESEARCH ON CITIZEN ATTITUDES

Examples of the kinds of questions to be answered are as follows:

1. Are citizen attitudes influenced as a result of participating in a community education activity, program, or project?

2. Can community councils influence community apathy?

3. How do community attitudes affect the success of community education programs?

c. THEORETICAL RESEARCH ON CITIZEN ATTITUDES

Clearly, it is the case that neither status nor relational research on citizen attitudes can be conducted intelligently without a clear understanding of the concept or hypothetical parameters of citizen attitudes. This kind of research would attempt to accomplish this task through the following kinds of questions:

1. Is there a relationship between citizen attitudes and behavior (note: other research has not shown a dramatic relationship between attitudes and behavior because of the effect of intervening variables)? If so, do attitudes influence behavior or vice versa?

2. What citizen attitudes are relevant to community educators?

3. Should a distinction be made between attitudes and other psychological variables (e.g., self-concept, internal-external control, etc.)?

4. Do attitudes or needs influence participation more?

d. THEORETICAL RESEARCH ON BARRIERS/FACILITATORS TO INTERAGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

This research would focus on the following kinds of questions:

1. What criteria exist for determining interagency partnership effectiveness?

2. What models of interagency partnerships have been developed?

3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the various interagency partnership models?

4. What variables influence interagency partnerships (e.g., personalities, funding, competitive goals, etc.)?

e. STATUS RESEARCH ON INTERAGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

Some examples of questions to be answered by this kind of research would be as follows:

1. What agencies are involved in the community education process?

2. What is the nature and extent of coordination between community schools and vocational centers?

3. How is agency duplication identified?

4. What is the extent of agency commitment to the community partnerships?

f. RELATIONAL RESEARCH ON INTERAGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

Some examples of questions to be answered by this kind of research would be as follows:

1. Does the success of interagency alliances depend upon the personalities of the agency directors?

2. What differences exist between private and public agencies with regard to realities of and attitudes toward cooperation?

3. Are some kinds of interagency relationships more effective than are others?

4. How do interagency relations influence other "components" of community education?

3. Secondary research efforts might focus on a few selected content areas either because they appeared next in need for the total group or because they were valued by specific groups. In particular:

a. Most of the respondents, with the notable exception of state level persons, expressed the need for all types of research on the Training of Community Education Personnel.

b. State level respondents expressed a greater need than did other groups for Theoretical research on Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships and on the Nature of Interagency Relationships.

c. System level respondents expressed a need for Status research on Use of Facilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

d. University level respondents expressed a need for Theoretical research on Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation.

4. The procedure employed in this study (development of a conceptual framework from existing questions) should now be reversed. Specific research questions should be developed in the priority areas. These should proceed along the lines of well-defined criteria including importance, immediacy of payoff, research feasibility, costs, time needed to conduct the research, level of specificity, degree of operationalization, as well as standard research criteria.

5. Although outside the purview of the present study, the following recommendation grows out of our involvement with the current literature in the field of community education. We see a great need for conceptual research on the development of "outcome" or criterion measures that can be used to assess the impact of community education programs. For example, we feel that attendance figures (a very common measure) do not speak to the issue of community education impact.

6. Funding for research should be made available, and specific criteria should be developed for selecting projects. These criteria might include:

   a. the research area is valued by practitioners (as found in this study)

   b. immediacy of payoff

   c. long term payoff

   d. feasibility

   e. cost

   f. time frame need to conduct the research

   g. adequacy of research design

   h. specificity, reliability, and validity of measures

   i. appropriateness of analytical procedures

   j. prior demonstration of research capabilities

## Bibliography


Beasley, B. J. *The availability and use of public school facilities for community education in Arkansas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1977.

Beder, H. W., III. *Community linkages in urban public school adult education programs: A study of cosponsorship and the use of community liaison personnel.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.

Boerrigter, G. C. *Techniques and procedures by which community utilization of school buildings can be achieved without interference with the kindergarten through grade twelve day school program.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1960.

Burbach, L. E. & Decker, H. J. (Eds.). *Planning and Assessment in Community Education.* Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1979.

Cannon, L. *An analysis of the interactions between a county community mental health center and local school districts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1974.

*Community Education Journal,* 1975, *5,* 2.

Community use of your schools. *School Management Magazine,* March, 1962, pp. 96-107.

Cook, N. C. *The state of the art of community education in South Carolina: The historical basis and current status.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1977.

Cook, N. C. Citizen Participation Issues, *Research in Community Education* (Research Report 79-103). Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1979a.

Cook, N. C. Facility Use Patterns, *Research in Community Education* (Research Report 79-101). Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1979b.

Cook, N. C. Interagency Relationships. *Research in Community Education* (Research Report 79-102). Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1979c.

Cunningham, L. L. & Nystrand, R. D. *Citizen participation in school affairs. A report to the Urban Coalition.* Washington, D. C.: The Urban Coalition, 1969.

DuBois, E. E. & Drake, S. The state of cooperative relations between community colleges and community schools. *Community Education Journal,* Jan.-Feb. 1975, *5*(1), 9-11.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *The schoolhouse in the city.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories & Praeger, 1968.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *Physical recreation facilities.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1973.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *Surplus school space: Options and opportunities.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1976.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *A concerned citizen's guide to community school centers* (No. 1). New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1978a.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *Educational facilities laboratories reports: Planning and managing the physical environment of public institutions* (Report No. 28). New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, June 1978b.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *Planning Community School Centers* (No. 2). New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1978c.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *Managing community school centers.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1979a.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *A resourcebook on community school centers.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1979b.

Educational Facilities Laboratories. *Using surplus school space for community school centers.* New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1979c.

Gansneder, B. M. Program Evaluation. In H. J. Burbach & L. E. Decker (Eds.), *Planning and assessment in community education.* Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1977.

Gay, J. E. *Development of a school health program model utilizing community health resources.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1974.

Glueck, E. *The community use of schools.* Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1927.

Hafen, W. J. *Administrative guidelines for the cooperative use of public school facilities for recreation purposes by community groups in the state of Utah.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1968.

Hansen, D. M. *Avenues of cooperation between three state agencies responsible for post high school education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1974.

Holland, J. E. *An analysis of the board policies and administrative practices which influence community use of public school property in six director school districts in Missouri.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1966.

Kaplan, M. H. & Sponsler, D. S. *Implementing community education research: An action plan.* Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, 1978, mimeo.

Koller,R. DeJ. *The availability and extent of use of public school facilities for community recreation in Alabama.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1973.

Liechty, T. A. *Patterns of citizen participation in education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1977.

McQuarrie, A. M. *Community use of selected public elementary schools in the state of Washington.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1963.

Miller, M. R. *The structure and process of school/community involvement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

Naslund, R. A. & Brown, C. M. School and the community. *Review of Educational Research,* 1958, *28,* 16-28.

National Recreation Association. School-city cooperation in recreation. *Recreation,* Feb. 1960, *53,* 80-82.

Otto, W. O. *The availability and extent of use of public school facilities for community recreation within school districts in the state of Wisconsin.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1972.

Selltiz, C., et. al. *Research Methods in Social Relations* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1976.

Stanwick, M. E. *Patterns of participation: Report of a national survey of citizen participation in educational decision making.* Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1975.

Stromquist, N. P. *Antecedent and concurrent conditions of participation: The case of participatory educational planning.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

Sumrall, R. *The educational park, the community school and the multi-service community center: An attempt toward holistic model interface.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1974.

Tasse, L. *A study of the key elements of agency-school cooperation and their relationships to community education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

Thorstenson, C. T. *A study of the availability and the extent of use of public school facilities for community recreation in the state of Utah.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1969.

Turner, R. G. *Utilization of large rural and suburban secondary school sites by school and community groups in North Carolina.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1965.

Valdes, P. B., Jr. *A study of the scope of cooperation and coordination between community colleges and community schools in Florida's Community College districts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova University, 1975.

Van Voorhees, C. Community education needs research for survival. *Phi Delta Kappan,* Nov. 1972, *54*(3), 203-205.

Voland, E. L. H. *Interorganizational relationships in community education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1978.

Weiss, M. W. *Coordination and cooperation between community colleges and community schools in selected community college districts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1974a.

Weiss, M. W. *A new role for community education in the community college through cooperation with community schools.* Louisville, Kentucky: Adult Education Association Commission on Adult Basic Education, 1974b.

Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. *Study of community education in Region V. Report 1: Components of exemplary community education programs in Michigan.* Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (DHEW), Jan. 1976.

Wood, G. S. & Santellanes, D. A. *Evaluating a Community Education Program.* Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1977.

## Appendix A1

**Research Questions and Needs as Listed in Cook's (1979b) Facility Use Patterns Research Report:**

1. Time and usage studies of school facilities.
2. What is the cost of maintenance and operation of schools for extended program operations?
3. What schools are really involved in community education?
4. What is the role of joint or area vocational schools?
5. What is the distinction between community schools and community education?
6. How can we develop facilities studies in the nation's schools in terms of time, usage, and costs?
7. Does the nature of the facility affect program success?
8. What potential methods are possible for meeting the costs of utilities and maintenance in facilities used for community education?
9. What are the limitations on activities that can be conducted by community schools?
10. What limitations exist with regard to equipment? What school equipment can be used and by whom?
11. What is the current status of charging fees for use of public school facilities? Who pays, what determines rates and what are the charges?
12. Who are the personnel critical to efficient facility operations and use by community groups?
13. What is the status of contractual arrangements between school districts and other agencies with regard to facility use?
14. What are the effects of providing a larger range of services at the community level through a local school?
15. How are restoration/renovation/operation costs met in Re-use situations?
16. What financial support patterns exist?
17. What are the results of experimental programs on usage patterns that exist, focusing on an agency such as a public library housed in a public school? Does a real or perceived problem exist?
18. What is the extent to which requests for public facility use are made by public, private, or non-profit organizations for fund-raising or profit-making ventures?
19. How does current legislation dealing with facility use and/or community education compare to legislation (state and federal) passed prior to 1970?

20. What characterizes effective and ineffective facility use patterns where community education programs are in operation?

21. If community educators intend to emphasize lifelong learning, what effect should this have on construction of facilities that will be conducive to lifelong learning programming?

22. What modes of inquiry are appropriate to community education research?

23. Do community centers make a difference or effect (1) quality of life in surrounding area? (2) property values in surrounding area? (3) vandalism and crime in surrounding area?

24. What criteria determine success or failure of centers?

25. Do multiple-use facilities save capitol/operating costs?

26. What are the energy/environmental effects and/or factors in reference to community schools?

27. What are the legal implications of facility utilization in community education programs?

28. What are the ramifications of the emerging complexity of role changes, organization and management in a multiple use facility.

*Note.* Questions 1-5 are reported to be a synthesis of research questions or needs identified by the 1971 and 1975 Research Symposia in Community Education and the Research Committee of the National Community Education Association. Questions 6-14 were derived by Cook from existing literature and research. Questions 15-28 represent a list of questions generated by Cook with the assistance of "several persons with expertise in the areas of facility use and community education."

## Appendix A2

**Research Questions and Needs as Listed in Cook's (1979c) Interagency Relationships Research Report.**

1. Identify patterns of coordination between community school and existing agencies.
2. Determine a process for introducing community education into the community agency system.
3. Identify effective agencies for initiating the community education process.
4. Explore the relationships between community education and other agencies.
5. Determine a process for accomplishing interagency coordination.
6. Explore the potential for reciprocal or cooperation relationships between schools and other agencies.
7. How is agency duplication identified?
8. What components of compatability could exist between schools and other federal (Teacher Corps, Model Cities, for example), state, and local programs?
9. What are the theoretical and/or philosophical ties between community education and other agencies?
10. What agencies are involved in the community education process?
11. Is there an identifiable role between community education and existing agencies?
12. Should community colleges be community education centers?
13. What are the financial advantages in inter-agency partnerships?
14. What is the nature and extent of coordination between community schools and vocational centers?
15. What differences exist between cooperation of community schools with other agencies and cooperation of traditional schools with other agencies?
16. What is the role of the community school director with respect to promotion of interagency coordination?
17. Identify methods of reducing interagency conflict at national, state, and local levels.
18. Methods of fostering coordination in planning new facilities.
19. Methods to increase cooperation to foster joint attacks on community problems.
20. What is the feasibility of joint development of proposals for seeking new monies?
21. What is the feasibility of hiring administrative personnel on a joint-funding basis?

22. What should be the criteria for evaluating interagency partnerships?

23. Who should evaluate interagency programs?

24. Are interagency alliances perceived as a threat to agency autonomy?

25. Is the concept of interagency partnerships fiscally sound?

26. Does the success of interagency alliances depend upon the personalities of the agency directors?

27. Is the role of the community education director crucial to the development of interagency alliances?

28. What agency relationships exist to provide comprehensive social services (recreational, health, educational, and so forth) for the handicapped and other persons with special needs?

29. What is the extent of agency commitment to the community education concept?

30. To what degree are educational agencies or programs (K - 12, Head Start, early childhood programs, vocational and technical education, adult education, parent education, colleges, universities, and so forth) coordinating their efforts, personnel, programs, funding, etc.?

31. What is the nature and extent of local linkages between community education and cooperative extension?

32. What interagency organizational structures have developed as a result of initiating community education?

33. What impact do residential schools have as a generating element in the community education process?

34. An analysis of common elements that exist with regard to agreements of cooperation.

35. What are client/participant perceptions of cooperation in the "ideal" and in the perceived reality.

36. What differences exist between private and public agencies with regard to realities of and attitudes toward cooperation?

37. What are the actual benefits and problems inherent in interagency partnerships?

38. An analysis of barriers to interagency alliances.

39. What is the cost-effectiveness/analysis of interagency programming?

40. What is the status of self-serving, self-perpetrating agencies that exist for their own benefit.

41. What modes of overcoming obstacles and/or resolving differencs have been found effective and why?

42. An analysis of the current status of publicly-financial agencies (Have they been "shotgunned" into communities? Have they become entrenched bureaucracies? Are attempts to deliver human services meager?).

43. Are all interagencies good? What criteria exist for determining interagency partnership effectiveness?

44. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the various interagency partnership models?

45. What is the extent of acceptancy by the public of the need for interagency relationships?

46. To what extent can we learn from previous mistakes/problems?

47. To what extent do different relationships work in different/similar situations?

48. What is the degree of transferability of research findings into actual operational principles or practices?

49. What is the relationship of interagency alliances to non-school-based community education models?

50. To what degree are interfacing agents or personnel recognized as important?

51. What is the extent of correlation between the community education process and interagency partnerships?

52. What is the relationship of interagency actions with other "components" of community education?

53. What are the extent and conditions by which interagency relationships are a determinent to community problem-solving and development?

54. What is the extent and form of vertical/horizontal relationships?

55. What are the potential/actual problems involved with interagency partnerships?

56. Case studies on the impact of community education projects on the delivery of human services.

57. What is the extent of "people problems" in developing interagency projects ("people coordinate, not agencies")--the effectiveness of human relations in establishing interagency partnerships.

*Note:* Questions 1-23 represent a synthesis of research questions or needs identified by the 1971 and 1975 Research Symposia in Community Education, the Research Committee of the National Community Education Association, and the former office of Community Education Research at the University of Michigan in its Research monographs. Questions 24-31 were generated by Cook from a review of literature and research. Questions 32-57 were suggested by the review team for the report.

## Appendix A3

**Research Questions and Needs as Listed in Cook's (1979) Citizen Participation Issues Research Report.**

1. What is the status of citizen participation in community education programs (non-federally-funded)?
2. What is the role of non-educators and/or paraprofessionals in community schools?
3. What are the patterns of community council development in community involvement in community education programs?
4. How are community councils best structured?
5. What is the work of a community council?
6. What is the influence of community councils on community education versus communities where no councils are in existence?
7. Does community education actually reach those people who are not already "doers" in a community?
8. Does the establishment of a community school create a favorable vote of response for public education programs?
9. What socio-economic groups appear to be most frequently represented in a community education program? Advisory councils?
10. To what extent have communities supported, through local effort, community education as opposed to a reliance on outside funding sources?
11. Do existing community councils represent the entire community?
12. Is there a normal transfer from adult education to community involvement?
13. What are the effects of community control and decentralization on community education, and vice versa?
14. How effective are existing community surveys?
15. Is there a relationship between types of funding and the involvement of people in the decision-making process?
16. Does involvement change the attitudes of people?
17. To what extent does the existing power structure respect the introduction of community education?

18. Can a paraprofessional function as a community school director? Under what conditions?

19. Are the schools or people ethnocentric with regard to community education?

20. How dependent is community education on good public relations?

21. How does community involvement affect the self-concept of low income families?

22. Does community education serve all ethnic groups? If not, what forces inhibit it?

23. Does community education affect interracial relationships positively or negatively?

24. Why are school boards sometimes non-supportive of community education?

25. Does community education affect the attitudes of rural citizens toward district reorganization?

26. What competencies should be inherent in council members?

27. Who decides the amount of power a council should have?

28. What is the influence of the community on school policy?

29. What is the influence of the school on community policy?

30. What is the influence of informal organizations on school policy?

31. What is the structure and function of advisory councils with respect to 1) assisting in millage/bond issues, 2) community agency coordination, 3) dealing with the community power structure, 4) in the decentralization process, 5) activities which take place outside of and after school?

32. What is the structure and role of advisory councils in relation to 1) parent-teacher associations, 2) parents within attendence boundaries, 3) teacher unions, 4) business and fraternal organizations, 5) city administration, 6) students?

33. What are determinants of council effectiveness with regard to 1) dispelling community apathy, 2) achievement level of students, 3) reduction of vandalism, 4) pupil discipline and safety, 5) pupil attendence, 6) self evaluation, 6) student rights and responsibilities and 7) patterns of communication between self and school boards, superintendents, principals, community school directors, teachers, parents, students, and non-parent community members?

34. Does community education foster citizen participation, or vice versa?

35. Do citizen participation programs emanating from the grass-roots level have more "staying-power" and effectiveness than mandated programs?

36. What is the relationship between school boards and community councils?

37. What is the nature and extent of community council support structures?

38. What is the criteria for evaluating council success?

39. What is the extent of utilization of volunteers and paraprofessioanls?

40. What is the role of volunteers and paraprofessioanls in a community education program?

41. What aspects of personality and/or ways of working with a community council are responsible for a meaningful relationship and effective operation?

42. What is the role of the student in citizen participation?

43. What models have been developed for council orientation and training?

44. What research from other fields (sociology, anthropology, psychology, and so forth) could be used in community education development?

45. What research findings are present with regard to other forms of citizen participation beyond volunteerism and advisory councils?

46. To what extent does community education foster the development of community problem solving outside the context of an organization or sponsoring agency?

47. What does research have to say about the limits of citizen involvement? At what points is it not beneficial and results in decreasing returns for all involved?

48. What research from overseas (particularly Socialist countries) has dealt with citizen participation and what are the findings? (Particularly community education overseas?)

49. What is the impact of the sponsoring organizations on the degree of autonomy and other factors of how citizen groups develop?

50. What community education approaches to citizen participation are suited especially for rural or isolated areas? Urban? Suburban?

51. To what extent do community residents view community education as a community participation process?

52. What are the identified negative aspects to citizen participation in community education?

53. What are the effects of mandated state citizen participation approaches through various laws and regulations?

54. How can citizen participation be fostered in community education over an extended time framework of ten to twenty years? What conditions are necessary to assist with longer course development?

55. What societal factors affect citizen participation in community education?

56. What kind of leadership training is necessary for community councils?

57. What are the most effective ways to achieve representation on a community council?

58. What types of administrative leadership styles are necessary to work with citizens?

59. What are the differences in function of various types of community councils (e.g., control, advisory, school-related, community problem-oriented, etc.)?

60. In what ways is the concept of power an operating factor in community education?

61. Is there a relationship between "organizational development" in schools and community or citizen involvement?

62. What factors enhance or impede an administrator's ability to facilitate citizen involvement?

63. What is the extent to which training or skill development opportunities are provided for citizens?

64. How significant is the community school coordinator's role in bringing about community involvement in decision-making?

65. Are community based process-oriented approaches to community involvement more effective than involvement through a program-oriented, community school approach?

66. What are the comparative effects of the primary funding source in community education (local, state, or federal) on citizen participation?

67. What are the similar and contrasting functions of school district-wide and local school building community councils?

68. Are there distinct phases in the citizen participation process that characterize well-established community education projects?

69. What differences exist in citizen participation functions among urban, suburban and rural community education projects?

70. Are citizen attitudes influenced as a result of participating in a community education activity, program or project?

*Note:* Questions 1-33 represent a synthesis of research questions or needs identified by the 1971 and 1975 Research Symposia in Community Education, the Research Committee of the National Community Education Association, and the former Office of Community Education Research at the University of Michigan. Questions 34-44 were generated by Cook from a review of literature and research. Questions 45-70 were suggested by members of the review team for this report.

## Appendix B

### SURVEY OF RESEARCH NEEDS IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

The survey has two parts. The first part requests demographic information which will allow a description of respondents and will make it possible to determine whether community educators who differ on various characteristics have differing perceptions of research needs. The second part requests your assessment of research needs in community education. Please respond to each question of the survey.

**Part I. Demographic Information:**

*DIRECTIONS: For items 1–4 please fill in the blanks with the necessary information.*

1. I work in _____
(state)

2. I am _____ years old.

3. I have been in my present position _____ years.

4. I have been a professional in the field of community education for a total of _____ years.

*DIRECTIONS: For items 5–10 please put a check mark in the appropriate blank.*

5. I am a Community Educator:

( ) a. with responsibilities at the building level.
( ) b. with responsibilities at the system-wide level.
( ) c. with responsibilities at the state level.
( ) d. with responsibilities at a university community education center.
( ) e. other _____
please specify

6. Sex: ( ) a. Male
( ) b. Female

7. The highest degree I hold is the:

( ) a. Bachelors
( ) b. Masters
( ) c. Doctorate
( ) d. other _____
please specify

8. My formal training in community education is:

( ) a. academic degree related (e.g., BA, MA, Ph.D.).
( ) b. through in-service work.
( ) c. short-term workshop.
( ) d. other _____
please specify

9. I have been involved in a community education research project before this one:

( ) a. yes
( ) b. no

10. I am interested in participating in community education research projects:

( ) a. yes
( ) b. no

**Part II. Research Needs:**

A content analysis of literature reviews (Cook, 1979) on facility usage, citizen participation and inter-agency cooperation was completed. The content analysis identified eighteen areas for research. Each of these could be examined in several ways, including theoretical or conceptual studies, status studies, and relational studies.

The survey has been divided into three sections which correspond to these types of studies. Each section is preceded by an explanation of the kind of research which you are asked to consider. Note that the same eighteen areas are listed under each kind of research.

Part II of the survey has three sections:

The first section, A, calls for your assessment of the need for **theoretical or conceptual research** on each of the eighteen areas of interest. Section B calls for your assessment of the need for **status research** on each of the eighteen areas of interest. Section C calls for your assessment of the need for **relational research** on each of the eighteen areas of interest. In each case, you are requested to rate the need for research from low (1) to high (5) on a five-point scale by circling the number of your choice on the scale. Please respond to each item.

CONTINUED ON REVERSE

**Part A: Theoretical or Conceptual Studies**

This kind of research would attempt to produce **position papers or literature reviews** on an area of interest. It would **not** include the collection of new empirical data. For example, with regard to facilities usage, the following questions might be asked: How should usage be defined? Is it the number of persons? The number of hours? The number of hours per person? How do professionals in other fields (business, sociology, organizational theory, etc.) define usage?

*DIRECTIONS:* *Rate the need, on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale, of doing* **theoretical studies aimed at producing position papers or literature reviews** *in the following eighteen areas. Circle the number that best reflects your assessment of the need for this type of study in each area.*

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 1. Facility Cost | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Nature of Community Councils | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Use of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Nature of Citizens in the Community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Nature of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Citizen Attitudes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Nature of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Policy of Facility Usage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Funding of Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Facility Users | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Management of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Cost of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Training of Community Education Personnel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Please fill in the blanks to indicate in which **two of the above eighteen areas** there is the greatest need for theoretical or conceptual research:

The greatest need for theoretical or conceptual research is in **area number** _____.

The second greatest need for theoretical or conceptual research is in **area number** _____.

**Part B: Status Studies**

This kind of research would focus on what is currently happening in community education. Empirical data would be collected to answer questions about current status. For example, with regard to facility usage the following kinds of questions might be asked: How many people use community education facilities? How much of the time are these facilities used?

*DIRECTIONS:* *Rate the need, on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale, of doing* **studies aimed at describing the current characteristics of community education programs** *for each of the following eighteen areas. Circle the number that best reflects your assessment of the need for this type of study in each area.*

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH Low | | | | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Facility Cost | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Nature of Community Council | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Use of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Nature of Citizens in the Community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Nature of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Citizen Attitudes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Nature of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH Low | | | | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Policy of Facility Usage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Funding of Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Facility Users | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Management of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Cost of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Training of Community Education Personnel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Please fill in the blanks to indicate in which **two of the above eighteen areas** there is the greatest need for current status studies:

100

The greatest need for status studies is in area number _____.

The second greatest need for status studies is in area number _____.

CONTINUED ON REVERSE

101

**Part C: Relational Studies**

This kind of research would focus on **relationships between variables** in community education and would also involve empirical data collection. These kinds of studies would focus on questions such as the following: How do legal factors influence the costs of community education? How does the nature of the community affect usage of community education centers? Are some kinds of programs more effective in increasing usage than are other kinds of programs? Which kinds of programs affect behavior?

*DIRECTIONS:* *Rate the need, on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) scale, of doing* **studies aimed at determining relationships between community education variables** *in the following eighteen areas. Circle the number that best reflects your assessment of the need for this type of study in each area.*

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 1. Facility Cost | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Nature of Community Council | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Use of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Barriers/Facilitators to Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Evaluation of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Nature of Citizens in the Community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Nature of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Citizen Attitudes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Nature of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| AREA | NEED FOR RESEARCH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | | | | High |
| 10. Administrative Issues in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Policy of Facility Usage | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Funding of Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Facility Users | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Administrative Issues in Citizen Participation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Management of Facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Cost of Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Types of Agencies in Interagency Relationships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Training of Community Education Personnel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Please fill in the blanks to indicate in which **two of the above eighteen areas** there is the greatest need for relational research:

There is the greatest need for relational research in **area number** _____.

There is the second greatest need for relational research in **area number** _____.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please mail the completed survey in the enclosed reply envelope to the **Bureau of Educational Research, 405 Emmet Street, Room 264, Ruffner Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903.**

## Appendix C

### Summary of the number of surveys sent and returned and the rate of return by region and state

| | No. Sent | No. Ret'd | Ret. Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Region I** | 254 | 147 | 57.9 |
| Connecticut | 29 | 18 | 62.1 |
| Maine | 18 | 9 | 50.0 |
| Massachusetts | 67 | 37 | 55.2 |
| New Hampshire | 3 | 3 | 100.0 |
| New Jersey | 54 | 29 | 53.7 |
| New York | 38 | 26 | 68.4 |
| Pennsylvania | 37 | 21 | 56.8 |
| Rhode Island | 5 | 3 | 60.0 |
| Vermont | 3 | 1 | 33.3 |
| **Region II** | 147 | 97 | 66.0 |
| District of Columbia | 9 | 4 | 44.4 |
| Delaware | 4 | 3 | 75.0 |
| Kentucky | 10 | 8 | 80.0 |
| Maryland | 17 | 8 | 47.1 |
| North Carolina | 30 | 22 | 73.3 |
| South Carolina | 18 | 9 | 50.0 |
| Tennessee | 28 | 18 | 64.3 |
| Virginia | 18 | 15 | 83.3 |
| West Virginia | 13 | 10 | 76.9 |
| **Region III** | 133 | 90 | 67.7 |
| Alabama | 40 | 29 | 72.5 |
| Florida | 61 | 39 | 63.9 |
| Georgia | 27 | 18 | 66.7 |
| Mississippi | 5 | 4 | 80.0 |
| **Region IV** | 134 | 90 | 67.2 |
| Arkansas | 13 | 11 | 84.6 |
| Kansas | 20 | 11 | 55.0 |
| Louisiana | 12 | 7 | 58.3 |
| Missouri | 23 | 17 | 73.9 |
| Oklahoma | 19 | 13 | 68.4 |
| Texas | 47 | 31 | 66.0 |

| | No. Sent | No. Ret'd | Ret. Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Region V** | 339 | 239 | 70.5 |
| Illinois | 17 | 9 | 52.3 |
| Indiana | 14 | 11 | 78.6 |
| Michigan | 277 | 198 | 71.5 |
| Ohio | 31 | 21 | 67.7 |
| **Region VI** | 160 | 107 | 66.9 |
| Iowa | 13 | 9 | 69.2 |
| Minnesota | 117 | 77 | 65.8 |
| Nebraska | 6 | 5 | 83.3 |
| North Dakota | 6 | 3 | 50.0 |
| South Dakota | 8 | 5 | 62.5 |
| Wisconsin | 10 | 8 | 80.0 |
| **Region VII** | 122 | 80 | 65.6 |
| Arizona | 18 | 11 | 61.1 |
| California | 30 | 20 | 66.7 |
| Colorado | 20 | 15 | 75.0 |
| Hawaii | 9 | 5 | 55.6 |
| Nevada | 7 | 3 | 42.9 |
| New Mexico | 6 | 5 | 83.3 |
| Utah | 32 | 21 | 65.6 |
| **Region VIII** | 93 | 61 | 65.6 |
| Alaska | 20 | 12 | 60.6 |
| Idaho | 11 | 6 | 54.5 |
| Montana | 8 | 5 | 62.5 |
| Oregon | 34 | 23 | 67.6 |
| Washington | 11 | 8 | 72.7 |
| Wyoming | 9 | 7 | 77.8 |